



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 29]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जुलाई 16, 1983/प्राषाद 25, 1905

No. 29]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1983/ASADHA 25, 1905

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या वाले जाती हैं जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।
 Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किये गये सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
 (other than the Ministry of Defence)

विस मंत्रालय

(राजन्य विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 जून, 1983

स्टाम्प

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th June, 1983

STAMPS

का०था० 2880.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899
 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उस शुल्क को भाफ़ करती है जो इंडस्ट्रियल-रीकन्स्ट्रक्शन कार्पोरेशन आफ़ इंडिया लिमिटेड द्वारा प्राप्तिसरी नोटों के रूप में जारी किए जाने वाले केवल पांच करोड़ और पचास लाख रुपये मूल्य के बंधगतों पर उन अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत प्रभार्य हैं।

S.O. 2880.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of Section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the bonus in the nature of promissory notes to the value of rupees five crores and fifty lakhs only to be issued by the Industrial Reconstruction Corporation of India Limited, Calcutta, are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 20/83-Stamps/F. No. 33/18/83-ST]

400 G 1/83

[मं. 20/83-स्टाम्पस्/फा० मं. 33/18/83-वि०क०]

(2911)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 जून, 1983

स्टाम्प

का०आ० 2881.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एन्डड्वारा उस शल्क को माफ करती है जो राष्ट्रीय सहकारिता विकास निगम द्वारा प्रोमिसरी नोटों के रूप में जारी किए जाने वाले केवल सत्रह करोड़ सत्तासी लाख रुपये मूल्य के बन्ध पत्रों पर उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत प्रभाव है।

[संख्या 21/83-स्टाम्प/का० सं० 33/10/83-बि०क०]

भगवान दाम, अवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th June, 1983

STAMPS

S.O. 2881.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the bonds in the form of promissory notes to the value of rupees seventeen crores and eighty seven Lakhs to be issued by the National Co-operative Development Corporation are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 21/83-Stamp/F. No. 33/10/83-ST]

BHAGWAN DAS, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 1983

आयकर

का०आ० 2882.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 15-6-82 की अधिसूचना संख्या 4681 [का० सं० 398/22/82-सा०क०(व०)] का अधिलंबन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एन्डड्वारा श्री पी०पी० हरी राव को जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना, श्री पी०पी० हरी राव द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण किए जाने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[संख्या 5281/का० सं० 398/8/83-आ०क० (ब०)]

New Delhi, the 28th June, 1983

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 2882.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India

in the Department of Revenue No. 4681 (F. No. 398/22/82-ITB) dated 15-6-1982, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri P. V. Hari Rao being a Gazetted Officer of Central Government to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri P. V. Hari Rao takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 5281/F. No. 398/8/83-IT(B)]

N. K. SHUKLA, Under Secy.

का०आ० 2883.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961

(1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 29-7-82 की अधिसूचना संख्या 4834 (का०सं० 398/22/82-आ०क०स०ब०) का अधिलंबन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एन्डड्वारा श्री जे०के० सोमयाजुलू को जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री जे०के० सोमयाजुलू द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण किए जाने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[संख्या 5283/का०सं० 398/8/83-आ०क० (ब०)]

S.O. 2883.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 4834 F. No. 398/22/82-ITB) dated 29-7-1982, Central Government hereby authorises Shri J. K. Somayajulu, being a Gazetted Officer of Central Government to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This notification shall come into force with effect from the date of Shri J. K. Somayajulu takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 5283/F. No. 398/8/83-IT(B)]

का०आ० 2884.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961

(1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 29-7-82 की अधिसूचना संख्या 4832 (का०सं० 398/22/82-आ०क०स०ब०) की अधिलंबन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एन्डड्वारा श्री एस० सूर्यनारायण को जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री एस० सूर्यनारायण द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण किए जाने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[संख्या 5285/का०सं० 398/8/83-आ०क०ब०]

S.O. 2884.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 4832 (F. No. 398/22/82-ITB) dated 29-7-1982 the Central Government hereby authorises Sri S. Suryanarayana, being a Gazetted Officer of Central Government to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This notification shall come into force with effect from the date of Sri S. Suryanarayana takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 5285/F. No. 398/8/83-IT(B)]

का० आ० 2885.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961
(1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 15-6-82 की अधिसूचना सं० 4679 (फा० सं० 398/22/82-आ० क० म० क०) का अधिलंघन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री एम० बी० रमेश का, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना, श्री एम० बी० रमेश द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण किए जाने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5287/फा० सं० 398/8/80-आ० क० ब०]

S.O. 2885.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 4679 (F. No. 398/22/82-ITB) dated 15-6-1982, the Central Government hereby authorises Sri S. B. Ramesh being a Gazetted Officer of Central Government to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date of Shri S. B. Ramesh takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 5287/F. No. 398/8/83-IT(B)]

का० आ० 2886.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961
(1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 18-9-80 की अधिसूचना संख्या 3666 (फा० सं० 398/26/80-आ० क० म० क०) का अधिलंघन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री आर० एम० बोनकर का, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना, श्री आर० एम० बोनकर द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण किए जाने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[संख्या 5289/फा० सं० 398/26/83-आ० क० ब०]

S.O. 2886.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in

the Department of Revenue No. 3666 (F. No. 398/26/80-ITCC) dated 18-9-1980, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri R. S. Sonkar, being a gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri R. S. Sonkar takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 5289/F. No. 398/26/83-ITB]

का० आ० 2887—आयकर अधिनियम 1961

(1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 24-3-82 की अधिसूचना संख्या 4536 (फा० सं० 398/11/81-आ०क०ब०) का अधिलंघन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री पी०सी० अलेकजेंडर को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री पी०सी० अलेकजेंडर द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण किए जाने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5291/फा० सं० 398/24/83-आ०क०ब०]

S.O. 2887.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 4536 (F. No. 398/11/81-ITB) dated 24-3-1982, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri P. C. Alexander being a gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. The Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri P. C. Alexander takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 5291 F. No. 398/24/83-ITB]

का०आ० 2888—आयकर अधिनियम 1961

(1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 21-8-81 की अधिसूचना संख्या 4189 (फा० सं० 398/9/81-आ०क०स०क०) का अधिलंघन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री पी० प्रार० बंसल को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री पी०प्रार० बंसल द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण किए जाने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5293/फा० सं० 398/22/83-आ०क०ब०]

S.O. 2888.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 4189 (F. No. 398/9/81-ITCC) dated 21-8-81 the Central Government hereby authorises Shri P. R. Bansal, being a Gazetted Officer of Central Government to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri P. R. Bansal, takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 5293/F. No. 398/22/83-ITB]

का०आ० 2889.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 20-2-80-की अधिसूचना सं० 3888 फा० सं० 398/9/81-आ० क० स० क०) का अधिविधन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री रत्न सिंह को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना, श्री रत्न सिंह द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण किए जाने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5295/फा० सं० 398/22/83-आ० क० ब०]

S.O. 2889.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 3888 (F.No. -398/9/81-ITCC) dated 20-2-1981, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Rattan Singh, being a gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri Rattan Singh takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer,

[No. 5295/F. No. 398/22/83-ITB]

का०आ० 2890.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण के केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री चानन सिंह को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना, श्री चानन सिंह द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण किए जाने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[संक्षा 5297/फा० सं० 398/28/83-आ० क० ब०]

एन० क० शुक्ल, अवर सचिव

S.O. 2890.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Chanan Singh, being a gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri Chanan Singh takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 5297/F. No. 398/28/83-ITB]

N. K. SHUKLA, Under Secy.

सं० 203/सीमा-शुल्क

का०आ० 2891.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 4 की उपशारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत सरकार के वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व और बीमा विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० 35-सीमाशुल्क तारीख 4 मार्च, 1972 का नियमित और संशोधन करती है, अस्तित्व :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, खंड (b) में, “मोतिहारी” शब्द का लोग किया जाएगा।

[फा० सं० 437/1/83-सीमा-शुल्क-4]

जैड० बी० नगरकर, उप सचिव,

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1983

No. 203/83-Customs

S.O. 2891.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) No. 35-Customs, dated the 4th March, 1972, namely:—

In the said notification, in clause (b), the word “Motihari” shall be omitted.

[F. No. 437/1/83-Cus. IV]

Z. B. NAGARKAR, Dy Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 17 जून, 1983

का०आ० 2892.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपशारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री एस० के० घोष को कोरापुड़ पंचवटी वास्त्र बैंक, जैपोर का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 1-3-1983 से प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक 31-3-1984 की समाप्त होने वाली अवधि की उस अधिक के रूप में निर्वाचित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री एस० के० घोष अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[मंड्या एफ 2-33/82-आर०आर० ब००]

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 17th June, 1983

S.O. 2892.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. K. Ghosh as the Chairman of the Koraput Pancha-

batis Gramya Bank, Jeypore and specifies the period commencing on the 1-3-1983 and ending with the 31-3-1984 as the period for which the said Shri S. K. Ghosh shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 2-33/82-RRB]

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 1983

का०आ० 2893.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा थी एस० सी० मेहता को ज्ञावुआ-धार शक्तिय ग्रामीण बैंक, ज्ञावुआ का अव्यक्त नियुक्त करती है तथा 20-6-1983 से प्रारम्भ होकर 30-6-1984 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि की उम अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान थी एस० सी० मेहता अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[संख्या एफ 2-71/82-आर०आर०बी०]

राम बहरा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd June, 1983

S.O. 2893.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. C. Mehta as the Chairman of the Jhabua-Dhar Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Jhabua and specifies the period commencing on the 20-6-1983 and ending with the 30-6-1984 as the period for which the said Shri S. C. Mehta shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 2-71/82-RRB]

RAAM BEHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 1 जूलाई, 1983

का०आ० 2894.—बैंककारी विनियम अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक को सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा यह घोषणा करती है कि (क) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) के उपखण्ड (I) और (II) के उपबंध 31 दिसम्बर 1983 तक यूनियन बैंक आफ इडियो पर उस सामातक लागू नहीं होगी, जहाँ तक ये उपबंध इसके अध्यक्ष तथा प्रबंध निदेशक के, “केरल इंडस्ट्रियल एण्ड टेक्नोकल कंसलटेंट्स आर्गेन्यू-इजेशन लि०” का निदेशक होने पर इसलिए पारंपरी लगाते हैं कि, वह कम्पनी अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 1) के अंतर्गत पंजाकृत कम्पनी है, और (ख) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 की उपधारा (3) के उपबंध 31 दिसम्बर, 1983 तक उपयुक्त पर उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होगे, जहाँ तक उक्त उपबंध बैंक की केरल इंडस्ट्रियल एण्ड टेक्नोकल कंसलटेंट्सी आर्गेन्यू-इजेशन लि० की शेयर धारिता पर पारंपरी लगाते हैं।

[संख्या 15/10/83-बी० आ०-III]

New Delhi, the 1st July, 1983

S.O. 2894.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that (a) the provisions of sub-clauses (i) and (ii) of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the said Act shall not apply for a period upto the 31st December, 1983 to Union Bank of India insofar as the said provisions prohibit its Chairman and Managing Director from being the Director of the Kerala Industrial and Technical consultancy Organisation Ltd., being a company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956) and that (b) the provisions of sub-section (3) of Section 19 of the said Act shall not apply for a period upto the 31st December, 1983 to the above bank insofar as the said provisions prohibit it from holding shares in the Kerala Industrial and Technical Consultancy Organisation Ltd.

[No. 15/10/83-B.O.III]

का०आ० 2895.—बैंक कारी विनियम अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक को सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा यह घोषणा करती है कि (क) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) के उपखण्ड (I) और (II) के उपबंध 30 जून, 1984 तक इंडियन ऑवरसीज बैंक पर उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे, जहाँ तक ये उपबंध उसके अध्यक्ष तथा प्रबंध निदेशक के “केरल इंडस्ट्रियल एण्ड टेक्नोकल कंसलटेंट्स आर्गेन्यू-इजेशन लि०” का निदेशक होने पर इसलिए पारंपरी लगाते हैं कि, वह कम्पनी अधिनियम 1956 (1956 का 1) के अंतर्गत पंजाकृत कम्पनी है, और (ख) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 की उपधारा (3) के उपबंध 30 जून, तक उपर्युक्त बैंक पर उस सामातक लागू नहीं होंगे जहाँ तक उक्त उपबंध उक्त बैंक की केरल इंडस्ट्रियल एण्ड टेक्नोकल कंसलटेंट्सी आर्गेन्यू-इजेशन लि० की शेयर धारिता पर पारंपरी लगाते हैं।

[संख्या 15/10/83-बी० आ० III]

S.O. 2895.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that (a) the provisions of sub-sections (i) and (ii) of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the said Act shall not apply for a period upto the 30th June, 1984 to Indian Bank, Syndicate Bank and Canara Bank insofar as the said provisions prohibit their Chairman and Managing Directors from being the Director of the Kerala Industrial and Technical Consultancy Organisation Ltd., being a company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956) and that (b) the provisions of sub-section (3) of Section 19 of the said Act shall not apply for a period upto the 30th June, 1984 to the above banks insofar as the said provisions prohibit them from holding shares in the Kerala Industrial and Technical Consultancy Organisation Ltd.

[No. 15/15/83-B.O. III]

का०आ० 2896.—बैंककारी विनियम अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक

की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा यह घोषणा करती है कि (क) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) के उपखण्ड (I) और (II) के उपबन्ध 30 जून, 1984 तक इंडियन ऑवरसीज बैंक पर उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे, जहाँ तक ये उपबन्ध इसके अध्यक्ष तथा प्रबंध निदेशक के “केरल इंडस्ट्रियल एण्ड टैक्नीकल कंसलटेंट्स आर्गेनेशन लि०” का निदेशक होने पर इसलिए पांचदंश लगते हैं कि, वह कम्पनी अधिनियम 1956 (1956 का 1) के अंतर्गत पंजीकृत कम्पनी है, और (ख) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 की उपधारा (3) के उपबन्ध 30 जून, 1984 तक उपयुक्त बैंकों पर उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे, जहाँ तक उक्त उपबन्ध उक्त बैंक की केरल इंडस्ट्रियल एण्ड टैक्नीकल कंसलटेंट्स आर्गेनेशन लि० को शेयर धारिता पर पांचदंश लगते हैं।

[सं० 15/18/83-बी० ओ०-III]
एन० डी० बत्रा, ऑवर सचिव

S.O. 2896.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that (a) the provisions of sub-clauses (i) and (ii) of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the said Act shall not apply for a period upto the 30th June, 1984 to Indian Overseas Bank insofar as the said provisions prohibit its Chairman and Managing Director from being the Director of the Kerala Industrial and Technical Consultancy Organisation Ltd., being a company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956) and that (b) the provisions of sub-section (3) of Section 19 of the said Act shall not apply for a period upto the 30th June, 1984 to the above bank insofar as the said provisions prohibit it from holding shares in the Kerala Industrial and Technical Consultancy Organisation Ltd.

[No. 15/18/83-B.O. III]

N. D. BATRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1983

का०आ० 2897.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबन्ध और प्रक्रीण उपबन्ध) योजना 1970 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ज) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्री एस० बी० एस० जूनेजा के स्थान पर वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग, नई दिल्ली के अपर सचिव श्री जे० एस० वेंजल को एतद्वारा पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संचया एफ० 9/16/83-बी०ओ० 1]

ब० वा० मीरचन्दनी, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1983

S.O. 2897.—In pursuance of sub-clause (h) of clause 3 of the Nationalised Banks (Management & Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri J. S. Baijal, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, New Delhi as a Director of the Punjab National Bank vice Shri S. V. S. Juneja.

[F. No. 9/16/83-B.O. 1]

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 16 जून, 1983

का०आ० 2898.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-वा० की उप धारा (1) के उपबन्ध 17 मित्तम्बर, 1983 तक बैंक आफ कोवीन लि० एनाकुलम पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[सं० 15/6/83-बी०ओ० III]
के० के० मिश्र, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 16th June, 1983

S.O. 2898.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank, hereby declares that the provisions of Sub-Section (1) of Section 10B of the said Act shall not apply to the Bank of Cochin Ltd., Ernakulam, till 17th September, 1983.

[No. 15/6/83-B.O.III]
K. K. MISRA, Director.

नई दिल्ली, 27 जून, 1983

का०आ० 2899.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा (3) की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व तथा बैंकिंग विभाग एस० ओ० 289-अ (संचया एफ० 4-86/75-ए० सी० (I) दिनांक 8-4-76) में भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है अर्थात् उक्त अधिसूचना में “बोलगीर तथा सम्बलपुर जिले” (डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स आफ बोलगीर एण्ड सम्बलपुर) शब्दों के स्थान पर “बोलगीर, सम्बलपुर तथा सुरेन्द्रगढ़ जिले” (डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स आफ बोलगीर, सम्बलपुर एण्ड सुरेन्द्रगढ़) शब्दों को प्रतिस्थापित किया जाए।

[सं० एफ० 1-18/81-आर० आर० बी०]
एस० एस० हसूरकर, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 27th June, 1983

S.O. 2899.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section (3) of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of Govt. of India in the Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue & Banking S.O. 289(E) (No. F. 4-86/75-AC(I) dated 8-4-76), namely in the said notification for the words “districts of Bolangir and Sambalpur” the words “districts of Bolangir, Sambalpur and Sundergarh” shall be substituted.

[No. F. 1-18/81-RRB]

S. S. HASURKAR, Dy. Secy.

बाणिज्य भ्रातालय

(समाहर्ता सीमाशुल्क समाहर्तालय, बंगलोर)

बंगलोर, 8 जून, 1983

सीमा शुल्क

का०आ० 2900.—सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा-8 में मुझे प्रदत्त शक्तियों प्रयोग करते हुए तथा इस कार्यालय की अधिसूचना सं० 1/81 सीमा० दिनांक 7-8-81 के

पैरा-3 के अंशतः परिवर्तन करके मैं, सी. के. गोपालकृष्ण य समाहृत्ता सीमाशुल्क, बंगलोर एतद्वारा बंगलोर इनलैड कण्टनर डिपो से सम्बन्धित सीमाशुल्क क्षेत्र (एरिया) की हड (निमिट) को निम्न प्रकार विनियोग करता हूँ—

दक्षिण:—सरकूलेशन एरिया, रेलवे कम्पाउण्ड के साथ स्टेशन रोड

उत्तर:—रेलवे निमिण कार्यालय, रेलवे क्वार्टर्स और अन्य कार्यालय

पूर्व:—मद्रास, सैड होम सिगनल

पश्चिम:—मिल्लर रोड के ग्रिज के अंतर्गत प्लेट-फार्म की समाप्ति (रेलवे) तक।

सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा-8 (ए) के अंतर्गत सीमाशुल्क क्षेत्र (एरिया) की उक्त विनियोग हड मालों को या किसी स्तर के मालों को भी लादने और उतारने के लिए योग्य स्थान के रूप में एतद्वारा अनुमोदित है।

[अधिसूचना सं. 2/83 सी०श० VIII/1/7/83 सी०-2/सी०श०]

सी०के० गोपालकृष्ण, समाहृता

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Collector of Customs : Bangalore)
Bangalore, the 8th June, 1983

CUSTOMS

S.O. 2900.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by section 8 of the Customs Act, 1962 and in partial modification of para 3 of this office notification No. 1/81-Cus. dated 7-8-81, I. C. K. Gopalakrishnan, Collector of Customs, Bangalore hereby specify the limits of the Customs area in respect of Bangalore Inland Container Depot as under:—

The whole of the Bangalore Cantonment Railway Station area measuring 60,619 Sq. mts. including the main Railway Station, Goodshed Area, the area meant for loading and unloading of goods to the wagons, parking area, Railway office, I.C.D. area, building and all structures bounded by the following:—

SOUTH :—Circulation area, Station Road along the Railway compound.

NORTH :—Railway construction office, other offices and Railway quarters.

EAST :—Madras side Mome Signal.

WEST :—The end of the platform upto railway under the bridge of Miller Road.

The above specified limits of Customs area under section 8(b) is also hereby approved proper places for loading and unloading of goods or for any class of goods under section 8(a) of Customs Act, 1962.

[Notification No. 2/83, Cus-VIII/1/7/83-C-2/CUS.]

C. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN, Collector

(मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-नियोजन का कार्यालय)

आवेदक

नई दिल्ली, 6 मई, 1983

का०आ० 2901:—श्री अमरर्जीत सिंह, सी/4, नारायण विहार, नई दिल्ली को सामान्य मुद्रा क्षेत्र के अंतर्गत टो० बी० भानीटर के साथ या उसके बिना एक बीडियो कैसेट रिकार्डर के आवात के लिए 10,000 रु मूल्य का एक सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट संख्या पी/जे/0396383/एन/एमएन/86/एच/82/एएलएस, दिनांक 4-2-83 प्रदान किया गया था। आवेदक

ने उपर्युक्त सी० निं० प० की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सी०निं०प० उनसे खो गया है या अस्थानस्थ हो गया है। आगे यह भी कहा गया है कि सी०निं०प० किसी भी सीमाशुल्क कार्यालय में पंजीकृत नहीं कराया गया था, अतः सी०निं०प० के मूल का बिल्कुल भी उपयोग नहीं हुआ है।

2. अपने इस तथ्य के समर्थन में, लाइसेंसधारी ने नोटरी पाइलक, दिल्ली के सामने स्टाम्प पेपर पर विधिवत् शपथ लेकर एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। तदनुसार, मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि मूल सी० निं० प० संख्या पी/जे/0396383/एन/एमएन/86/एच/82/एएलएस, दिनांक 4-2-83 आवेदक से खो गया है। अस्थानस्थ हो गया है। यथा संशोधित, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की उप-धारा 9 (सीसी) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री अमरर्जीत सिंह, सी/4, नारायण विहार, नई दिल्ली के नाम में जारी किए गए मूल सी० निं० प० सं० सी०पी/जे/0396383/एन/एमएन/86/एच/82/एएलएस, दिनांक 4-2-83 को एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

3. सी० निं० प० की अनुलिपि प्रति आवेदक को अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[मि० सं० 17/4444/एएम-83/एएलएस/249]

बी० आर० अश्वीर,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-नियर्ति

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi the 6th May, 1983

S.O. 2901.—Shri Amargit Singh, C/4, Narain Vihar, New Delhi was granted a C.C.P. No. P/J/0396389/N/MN/86/H/82/ALS dated 4-2-83 for Rs. 10,000 for the import of one Video Cassette Recorder with or without T.V. Monitor under G.C.A. The applicant has applied for issue of a Duplicate copy of the above mentioned C.C.P. on the ground that the original CCP has been lost or misplaced. It has further been stated that the C.C.P. was not registered with any Custom Authorities and as such, the value of CCP has not been utilised, at all.

2. In support of this contention, the licensee has filed an affidavit on stamp paper duly sworn in before a Notary Public, Delhi, I am accordingly satisfied that the original C.C.P. No. P/J/0396389/N/MN/86/H-82-ALS dated 4-2-83 has been lost/misplaced by the applicant. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-55, as amended from time to time, the said original C.C.P. No. P/J/0396389/N/MN/86/H/82/ALS dated 4-2-83 issued to Shri Amargit Singh, C/4, Narain Vihar, New Delhi is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate copy of C.C.P. is being issued to the applicant, separately.

[F. No. 17/4444/AM 83/ALS/249]

B. R. AHIR, Dy. Chief Controller of
Imports & Exports.

कर्जा भंडालय

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 जून, 1983

का०आ० 2902:—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की

धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, भारत के राजपत्र भाग II, खंड 3, उपधारा (ii) तारीख 1 अगस्त, 1981 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के उर्जा मंत्रालय (कोयला विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं०का० आ० 2084 तारीख 16 जुलाई, 1981 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से भंगन अनुसूची में विनियोग परिक्षेत्र की भूमि के 5050 एकड़ (लगभग) या 2043.665 हेक्टर (लगभग) में कोयले का पर्योक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त भूमि के एक भाग में कोयला अधिनियम है;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हए;

(क) इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 3288.842 एकड़ (लगभग) या 1330.977 हेक्टर (लगभग) माप की भूमि में खनियों के खनन, खदान, बोर करने, उनकी खुदाई करने और उन्हें तलाश करने, उन्हें प्राप्त करने, उन पर कार्य करने और उन्हें ले जाने के अधिकारों का, अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है।

टिप्पणी (1) इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले रेखांक का विरीक्षण, कलकटा, बिलासपुर (मध्य प्रदेश) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक 1, काउंसिल हाउस म्यूट, कलकटा के कार्यालय में अश्वा बेस्टन कॉलफोटड मिलिट्री (राजस्व अनुभाग) कोल एस्टेट नियंत्रित लाइन्स, नगपुर 440001 (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

टिप्पणी-2 कोयला धारक थेन (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 8 के उपवन्धों की ओर ध्यान अक्षय किया जाता है जिसमें नियंत्रित उपवन्धित है-

“8(1) कोई व्यक्ति जो किसी भूमि में जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है, द्वितीय है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिन के भीतर सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकता।

स्टार्टिकरण— इस धारा के अर्थात् यह आपत्ति नहीं सारी जाएगी कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खनन संक्रियाएं करना चाहता है और ऐसी संक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करना चाहिए।

(2) उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक आपत्ति संक्षम प्राधिकारी को लिखित रूप में को जाएगी और संक्षम प्राधिकारी आपत्तिकर्ता को स्वयं सुने जाने का या विधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनायाई का अवनंतर देगा और ऐसी सभी आपत्तियों को सुनने के पश्चात् और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच, यदि कोई है, करने के पश्चात् जो वह आवश्यक समझता है वह या

तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसा भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आपत्तियों पर अपनी सिफारियों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके पिनिश्चय के लिए देगा।

(3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति जिसी भूमि में हितवद्ध समस्या जाएगा जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करते का हकदार हो— यदि भूमि या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर निए जाने।

टिप्पणी-3 केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस म्यूट, कलकटा को उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन संक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया है।

अनुसूची

राजगमार उत्तर विस्तार ब्लॉक कोरबा कोयलाडेव जिला-बिलासपुर (मध्य प्रदेश)

रेखांक सं० सी-१ (ई०) III डी० आर० 246-1282
तारीख 11 दिसम्बर, 1982

जिसमें ऐसी भूमि दिखित की गई जहां खनियों के खनन, खदान, बोर करने, उनकी खुदाई करने, उन्हें तलाश करने, उन्हें प्राप्त करने, उन पर कार्य करने और उन्हें ले जाने के अधिकारों का अर्जन किया जाता है।

खनन अधिकार

क्रम सं०	ग्राम का नाम	हल्का सं०	खेत्रफल	तहसील	जिला सं०
1.	केसला	19	108	कटधोरा विलास पुर	
2.	गोरमा (असर्वेक्षण)	19	—	—	—
3.	नेवनारा (असर्वेक्षण)	19	—	—	—

खेत्रफल (एकड़ में) कुल टिप्पणी

सरकारी बन राजस्व भूमि भूमि भूमि

10.571 429.771 42.239 482.581 भाग

— — — 1966.280 भाग

— — — 839.981 भाग

कृत धैत्र	3288.842 एकड़
	(लगभग)
या	
1330.977 हैक्टर	
	(लगभग)

ग्राम केसला में अजिन किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्याक 49भाग, 79भाग, 80भाग, 83/1भाग, 83/2, 87भाग 88भाग, 89भाग, 90 से 99, 100भाग, 101, 102 103/2 भाग, 103/3 भाग, 105/1 भाग, 105/2 भाग, 141भाग, 142भाग, 143भाग, 144, 145, 145भाग, 147भाग, 148 से 160, 161भाग, 162 से 166, 167भाग, 168भाग, 170, 171भाग, 172 से 175, 176भाग, 177भाग, 178भाग, 191भाग, 194भाग और 261भाग।

ग्राम गोरमा अजिन किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्याक असर्वेक्षित:

ग्राम सेवनारा में अजिन किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्याक असर्वेक्षित सीमा वर्णन

क-व रेखा राजगमार और केसला ग्रामों की सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है जो का० आ० स० 2989, नारीख 7-10-1963 द्वारा कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास अधिनियम, 1957 की धारा 9(1) के अधीन अजिन राजगमार बलाक (कोरबा क्षेत्र) की पश्चिमी सीमा भी है और बिंदु "क" पर मिलती है।

घ-ग-घ रेखा राजगमार और गोरमा (असर्वेक्षित) ग्रामों की भागत : सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ और तेवनारा (असर्वेक्षित) और राजगमार ग्रामों की भागत : नम्मिलि ; सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है जो का० आ० स० 2989, नारीख 7-10-1963 द्वारा कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास अधिनियम, 1957 की धारा 9(1) के अधीन अजिन राजगमार बलाक (कोरबा क्षेत्र) की उत्तरी सीमा भी है और बिंदु "घ" पर मिलती है।

घ-इ रेखा तेवनारा (असर्वेक्षित) और मोहर (असर्वेक्षित) ग्रामों की सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और बिंदु "इ" पर मिलती है।

इ-ब रेखा ग्राम तेवनारा (असर्वेक्षित) की उत्तरी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और बिंदु "च" पर मिलती है।

ब-छ रेखा ग्राम गोरमा (असर्वेक्षित) से होकर जाती है और गोरमा (असर्वेक्षित) और केसला ग्रामों की सम्मिलित सीमा पर बिंदु "ए" पर मिलती है।

छ-ज-झ रेखा गोरमा (असर्वेक्षित) और केसला ग्रामों की भागत : सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है फिर

ग्राम केसला में 'लाट स० 79,80.261,49 मे होकर जाती है और उसी ग्राम में बिंदु "झ" पर मिलती है।

झ-क रेखा ग्राम केसला में 'लाट स० 49, 261, 83/1, 88, 87, 89, 103/3, 103/2, 100, 105/1, 105/2, 147, 146, 142, 141, 143, 176, 178, 177, 171, 168, 161, 167, 191, 194 से होकर जाती है और आरम्भिक बिंदु "क" पर मिलती है।

[स० 19/3/83-सी०एल०]

समय सिंह, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 24th June, 1983

S.O. 2902.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Energy Department of Coal S.O. No. 2084, dated the 16th July, 1981, under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) and published in the Gazette of India, in Part II, Section 3. Sub-section (ii), dated the 1st August, 1981, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for Coal in 5050.00 acres (approximately) or 2043.665 hectares (approximately) of the lands in locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that Coal is obtainable in a part of said lands;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire;

The rights to mine, quarry, bore, dig and search for, win, work and carry minerals in the lands measuring 3288.842 acres (approximately) OR 1330.977 hectares (approximately) described in Schedule appended hereto.

Note.—1. The plans of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Bilaspur (Madhya Pradesh) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta or in the office of the Western Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Coal Estate, Civil Lines, Nagpur-440001. (Maharashtra).

Note.—2. Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of section 8 of the aforesaid Act, which provide as follows :—

Objections to acquisition.—"8(1)—Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights or in or over such land.

Explanation.—It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of Coal and that such operations should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

(2) Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing and the competent authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a Legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all

such objections and after making such further enquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either makes a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect of different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land to the Central Government, containing his recommendations on the objections, together with record of the proceedings held by him for the decision of that Government.

(3) For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim and interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act."

Note.—The Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta, has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under the Act.

SCHEDULE
RAJGAMAR NORTH EXTENSION BLOCK
KORBA COALFIELD
District—BILASPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)

Plan No. C-1(E)III/DR/246-1282 Date 11-12-1982
 (Showing lands where rights to mine, quarry, bore, dig and search for, win, work, and carry away minerals are to be acquired).

MINING RIGHTS

Sl. No.	Name of village	Halka No.	Khewat No.	Tahsil	District	Area in Acres			Total	Remarks
						Govt. Land	Forest Land	Revenue Land		
1.	Kesla	19	108	Katghora	Bilaspur	10.571	429.771	42.239	482.581	Part
2.	Górmá (U/S)*	19	—	-do-	-do-	—	—	—	1966.280	Part
3.	Tewanara (U/S)*	19	—	-do-	-do-	—	—	—	839.981	Full

Total Area — 3288.842 Acres (approximately)

OR

1330.977 Hectares (approximately)

* (U/S) Stands for unsurveyed.

Plot Numbers, to be acquired in village Kesla :

49P, 79P, 80P, 83/1P, 82/2, 87P, 88P, 89P, 90 to 99, 100P, 101, 102, 103/2P, 103/3P, 105/1P, 105/2P, 141P, 142P, 143P, 144, 145, 146, 147P, 148 to 160, 161P, 162 to 166, 167P, 168P, 170, 171P, 172 to 175, 176P, 177P, 178P, 191P, 194P and 261P.

Plot numbers to be acquired in Village Gorma:—

Unsurveyed.

Plot numbers to be acquired in Village Tewanara:—

Unsurveyed.

BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

A-B	Line passes along the common boundary of Villages Rajgamar and Kesla which is also a western Boundary of Rajgamar Block (Korba Coalfield) acquired under section 9(1) of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 vide S.O. No. 2989, dated 7-10-1963 and meets at point "B".
B-C-D	Line passes partly along the common boundary of Villages Rajgamar and Gorma (Unsurveyed) and partly along the common boundary of Tewanara (unsurveyed) and Rajgamar which is also a northern boundary of Rajgamar Block (Korba Coalfield) acquired under section 9(1) of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957, vide S.O. No. 2989, dated 7-10-1963, and meets at point "D".
D-E	Line passes along the common boundary of Villages Tewanara (unsurveyed) and Mouhar (unsurveyed) and meets at point "E".

E-F	Line passes along the northern boundary of Village Tewanara (unsurveyed) and meets at point "F".
F-G	Line passes through Village Gorma (unsurveyed) and meets on the common boundary of Villages Gorma (unsurveyed) and Kesla at point "G".
G-H-I	Line passes partly along the common boundary of Villages Gorma (unsurveyed) and Kesla then proceeds through Village Kesla in Plots nos. 79, 80, 261, 49 and meets in the same Village at point "I".
I-A	Line passes through Village Kesla in Plots Nos. 49, 261, 83/1, 88, 87, 89, 103/3, 103/2, 100, 105/1, 105/2, 147, 146, 142, 141, 143, 176, 178, 177, 171, 168, 161, 167, 191, 194 and meets at starting point "A".

[No. 19/3/83-CL]

SAMAY SINGH, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

स्वास्थ्य विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1983

का. आ. 2903.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् नियम, 1957 के नियम 2 के संगठ "घ" के अनूसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा गुजरात आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद्, अहमदाबाद के रजिस्ट्रार को गुजरात राज्य में भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 102) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के संगठ (ग) के अन्तर्गत भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् के एक सदस्य के निर्वाचन करने के लिए निर्वाचन अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है।

[मं. वी. 11013/14/82-एम. ई. (पी.)]

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1983

S.O. 2903.—In pursuance of clause (d) of rule 2 of the Indian Medical Council Rules, 1957, the Central Government hereby appoints the Registrar, Gujarat Medical Council, Ahmedabad as the Returning Officer for the conduct of election of a member of Medical Council of India under clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956) in the State of Gujarat.

[No. V. 11013/14/82 M.E.(Policy)]

का. आ. 2904.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 102) की धारा 14 की उप-धारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् से परामर्श करने के बाद एतद्वारा निर्देशित करती है कि पीरस विश्वविद्यालय फ्रांस द्वारा दी गई "एम डी." डिक्टिस अहंतर उस अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए मान्य विकल्प अहंता होगी।

[मं. वी. 11016/9/80-एम. ई. (पी.)]

S.O. 2904.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consultation with the medical Council of India, hereby directs that

the medical qualification "M. D." granted by the University of Paris, France, shall be a recognised medical qualification for the purposes of that Act.

[No. V. 11016/9/80-M. E. (P)]
P. C. JAIN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 जुलाई, 1983

का. आ. 2905 यह: भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के संगठ (ख) के उपबन्धों का पालन करते हुए विभिन्न गुजरात विश्वविद्यालय की सीनेट द्वारा डा० महेश्कुमार किकुभाई देसाई को डा० एन० आर० मेहता के स्थान पर 30 मार्च, 1983 में भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् का सदस्य निर्वाचित किया गया है।

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा सत्कालीन स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की 9 जनवरी 1960 की अधिसूचना सं. 5/13/59-एम 1 (का० आ०) 138 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थातः—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के संगठ (ख) के अधीन निर्वाचित" शब्द के अन्तर्गत क्रम सं. 36 और उससे सम्बंधित प्रविद्यियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित क्रम संख्या और प्रविद्यियाँ रखी जाएं, अर्थातः—

"36. डा० महेश्कुमार किकुभाई देसाई, एम० डी० सुविधा क्लिनिक, सुधार फार्मलिया,
गलेमंडी, सूरत -395003"

[मं. वी. 11013/13/83 एम० ई० (पी.)]

New Delhi, the 4th July, 1983

S.O. 2905.—Whereas in pursuance of the provisions of clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956) Dr. Maheshkumar Kikubhai Desai, has been elected by the Senate of the South Gujarat University to be a member of the Medical Council of India with effect from the 30th March 1983 vice Dr. N. R. Mehta;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (i) of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the erstwhile Ministry of Health No. 5/13/59-MI (S.O. 138), dated the 9th January 1960, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading "Elected under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3" for Serial Number 36 and the entries relating thereto, the following Serial Number and entries shall be substituted, namely :—

"36. Dr. Maheshkumar Kikubhai Desai, M. D., Suvidha Clinic, Suthar Falia, Galemardi, Surat-395003."

[No. V. 11013/20/83-M. E. (Policy)]

का०आ० 2906 यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भारतीय आयु-विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (क) के उपबन्धों का पालन करते हुए मराठवाडा विश्वविद्यालय की भैनिट द्वारा सरकारी मेडिकल कालेज औरंगाबाद के विकिरण विज्ञान के व्याख्याता डा० आर० एम० अम्बुलगेकर को 24 मार्च, 1983 से भारतीय आयु-विज्ञान परिषद का सदस्य निर्वाचित किया गया है।

अतः उब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वाग्य तत्कालीन स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की 9 जनवरी, 1960 की अधिसूचना 5-13/59 एम० (एस०आ० 138) निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (क) के अधीन निर्वाचित" शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत क्रम सं० 10 और उससे सम्बंधित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित क्रम संख्या और प्रविष्टियां रखी जाएं, अर्थात् :—

"10. डा० एस० सौ० लाहिरी,

स्वास्थ्य सेवा निदेशक एवं

सचिव (पद्धति) पश्चिम बंगाल सरकार"

[सं० बी० 11013/18/83-एम० ई० (पो)]

S.O. 2906.—Whereas the Central Government in pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), and in consultation with the Government of West Bengal, have nominated Dr. S. C. Lahiri, Director of Health Services and Secretary (Ex-Officio) to the Government of West Bengal to be a member of the Medical Council of India vice Dr. P. B. Chakraborty, with effect from the 7th February 1983;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the erstwhile Ministry of Health No. S. O. 138, dated the 9th January, 1960, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading "Nominated under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 3", for Serial Number 10 and the entry relating thereto, the following Serial Number and entry shall be substituted, namely :—

10. Dr. S. C. Lahiri, Director of Health Services and Secretary (Ex-Officio) to the Government of West Bengal."

[No. V. 11013/18/83-M. E. (Policy)]

का०आ० 2907 यतः भारतीय आयुविज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) के उपबन्धों का पालन करते हुए मराठवाडा विश्वविद्यालय की भैनिट द्वारा सरकारी मेडिकल कालेज औरंगाबाद के विकिरण विज्ञान के व्याख्याता डा० आर० एम० अम्बुलगेकर को 24 मार्च, 1983 से भारतीय आयु-विज्ञान परिषद का सदस्य निर्वाचित किया गया है।

अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वाग्य तत्कालीन स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की 9 जनवरी, 1960 की अधिसूचना 5-13/59 एम० (एस०आ० 138) निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) के अधीन निर्वाचित" शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत क्रम संख्या 23 और उससे सम्बंधित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित क्रम संख्या और प्रविष्टियां रखी जाएं, अर्थात्

"23. डा० आर० एम० अम्बुलगेकर,
विकिरण विज्ञान व्याख्याता,
सरकारी मेडिकल कालेज,
औरंगाबाद-431004, महाराष्ट्र"

[सं०बी० 11013/20/83-एम० ई० (पो)]
पी० सी० जैन, अवर सचिव,

S.O. 2907.—Whereas in pursuance of the provisions of clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956) Dr. R. M. Ambulgekar, Lecturer in Radiology, Government Medical College, Aurangabad, has been elected by the Senate of the Marathawada University to be a member of the Medical Council of India with effect from the 24th March, 1983;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the erstwhile Ministry of Health No. 5-13/59-MI (S.O. 138) dated the 9th January 1960, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading "Elected under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3" for Serial Number 23 and the entries relating thereto the following Serial Number and entries shall be substituted, namely :—

"23. Dr. R. M. Ambulgekar, Lecturer in Radiology, Government Medical College, Aurangabad-431004 Maharashtra".

[No. V. 11013/20/83-M. E. (Policy)]
P. C. JAIN, Under Secy.

साचा और नागरिक-पूर्ति मंत्रालय

काम विभाग

आवेदा

नई विली, 24 जून, 1983

का०आ० 2908 यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने खाद्य विभाग, भैनिट खाद्य निदेशालयों, अप्राप्ति निदेशालयों, और खाद्य विभाग के बेतन तथा लेखा कार्यालयों द्वारा किये जाने वाले खाद्यान्नों, के कथ, भण्डारकरण, संचलन, परिवहन, वितरण तथा विक्रय के क्रृत्यों का पालन करना बन्द कर दिया है, जो कि खाद्य निगम अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 37) की धारा 13 के अधीन भारतीय खाद्य निगम के क्रृत्य हैं।

और यह खाद्य विभाग, क्षेत्रीय खाद्य निदेशालयों उपायि निदेशालयों और खाद्य विभाग के बेनेन तथा लेखा कार्यालयों में कार्य कर रहे और, उपरिवर्णित क्रत्यों के पालन लगे निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों और कर्मचारियों के केन्द्रीय सरकार के तारीख 16 अप्रैल, 1971 के परिवर्त के प्रत्युत्तर में उसमें विनिर्दिष्ट तारीख के अन्दर भारतीय खाद्य निगम के कर्मचारी न बनने के अपने आशय को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12ए की उपधारा (1) के प्रत्युक द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित सूचना रही दी गई है।

अतः अब खाद्य निगम अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 37) यथा अध्यतन संशोधित की द्वारा 12ए द्वारा प्रदत्त अस्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एवं द्वारा निम्नलिखित कर्मचारियों को प्रत्येक के सामने दी गई तारीख से भारतीय खाद्य निगम में स्थानान्तरित करती है:—

क्रम अधि- सं. कारी/	केन्द्रीय सरकार स्थानान्तरण के अधीन स्थायी समय के केन्द्रीय निगम में कर्मचारी पद सरकार के स्थानान्तरण का नाम अधीन पद
1. ओ निर्मल कुमार चक्रबर्ती	तकनीकी सहायक 1-3-69

[संख्या 52/1/82-एफ सी-III]
एस० के० स्वा अवरणी, सचिव

MINISTRY OF FOOD & SUPPLY

(Department of Food)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th June, 1983

S.O. 2908.—Whereas the Central Government has ceased to perform the functions of purchase, storage, movement, transport, distribution and sale of food-grains done by the Department of Food, the Regional Directorates of Food, the procurement Directors and the Pay & Accounts Offices of the Department of Food which under section 13 of Food Corporations Act, 1964 (37 of 1964) are the functions of the Food Corporation of India;

And whereas the following officers and employees serving in the Department of Food, the Regional Directorate of Food, the procurement Directorates and the Pay & Accounts Offices of the Department of Food and engaged in the performance of the functions mentioned above have not in response to the circular of the Central Government dated the 16th April, 1971 intimated, within the date specified therein, their intention of not becoming employees of the Food Corporation of India as required by the proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 12A of the said Act,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 12A of the Food Corporation Act, 1964 (37 of 1964) as amended upto date the Central Government hereby transfer the following officer to the Food Corporation of India with effect from the date mentioned against him:—

S. No.	Name of the officer/ employee	Permanent Post held under the Central Govt.	Post held under the transfer to Govt. at FCI.	Date of transfer
1.	Shree Nirmal Kumar Chakrabarti	—	Technical Assistant	1.3.69

[No. 52/1/82-I.C. III]
S. K. SWAMI, Under Secy.

नीधन और परिवहन मंत्रालय

(नीधन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 4 जुलाई, 1983

का०००१० २९०९.—दीप्घर अधिनियम, 1927 (1927 का 17) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, रीधघारों के लिए केन्द्रीय मलाहकार समिति का कायेगत 17 जून, 1953 से 6 मध्येन की ओर अवधि के लिए या नई समिति के पुनर्गठन तक, इनमें जो भी पहले दो, बढ़ायी है। उक्त समिति, भारत सरकार के नीधन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (नीधन पक्ष) की समय-समय पर यथासंशोधित अधिसूचना सूच्या का आ० 1868 दिनांक 17-6-1981 द्वारा नियुक्त की गयी थी।

[न० एस० डब्ल्यू एलएलई-४/८३-पम०]

राजोव श्रीवास्तव, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING WING

(Shipping Wing)

New Delhi, the 4th July, 1983

S.O. 2909.—In pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Lighthouse Act, 1927 (17 of 1927), the Central Government at hereby extends the terms of the Central Advisory Committee for Lighthouses, appointed vide the Notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping & Transport (Shipping Wing) No. S.O. 1868 dated 17th June 1981, as amended from time to time, for a further period of six months with effect from 17th June, 1983 or till such time as the new Committee is reconstituted, whichever is earlier.

[No. SW/LLE-8/83-MT]

RAJIV SRIVASTAVA, Director

MINISTRY OF LABOUR & REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour)

New Delhi, the 27th June, 1983

S.O. 2910.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Vikas Bhawan of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL

TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri J. P. Singh, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 76 of 1981

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Vikas Bhawan of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.
 On behalf of the workmen—Shri S. Bose, Secretary
 Rastriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, 20th June, 1983

AWARD

This is a reference under S.10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its order No. L-20012(201)/81-D.III (A) dated 12th November, 1981 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the workmen of Vikash Bhawan of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia District Dhanbad that Shri Raju Prasad, Staff Car Cleaner should be treated as an employee of the management and paid wages in category-I is justified ? If so, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled and from which date ?”

2. The concerned workman Shri Raju Prasad is a Staff Car Cleaner. He was engaged for cleaning of cars attached to the office of Development & Construction Division, Vikash Bhawan of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited. For the first time he was engaged as a Staff Car Cleaner in Bhagatdih as early as in 1978 and was paid at the rate of 50 Paise for each car attended by him. The rate was subsequently enhanced for 75 Paise for each car. The calculation was made on monthly basis and he was paid on voucher prepared for the purpose. His monthly income never exceeded Rs. 200. He was not paid any other allowances as admissible to other staff. The workman himself as well as the union on his behalf represented the matter before the Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. management for payment of category I time rate of wages besides other benefits available to the permanent employees as provided in the Coal Wage Board recommendation for such employees. The management refused to acced to the demand of the workman and his union whereupon this industrial dispute was raised before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Dhanbad vide union's letter dated 6-4-81. In the conciliation proceeding the management took an adamant attitude and therefore the conciliation failed. The failure report was submitted by the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) vide his letter dated 19-6-81. The Ministry considered the dispute and has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

3. The management has taken the plea that Shri Raju Prasad is not a workman of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited. According to the management he was a contractor entrusted with the work of cleaning of staff cars at certain rates. Another plea taken is that the establishment of Vikash Bhawan of M/s. B.C.C.L is not a mine and therefore the Central Government is not the appropriate Government for such an establishment. For this reason it is stated that the reference is without jurisdiction and that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate the dispute.

4. It has come out in evidence that after this reference was made the management of M/s. B.C.C.L has stopped the concerned workman from work. The prayer of the concerned workman is that he is entitled to be treated as permanent employee of the management and he should be paid category I wages with other allowances from January, 1978.

5. The facts in this case are not disputed. We have to look into the question as to whether the concerned workman as a Staff Car Cleaner is contractor or a workman. It has been contended on behalf of the workman that so far as the work entrusted to the concerned workman is involved, there is no element of contract. It has been shown that even before nationalisation the wage board in its recommendation in 1967 noted the job of Car cleaners. Wage Board recommendation.

Vol. II, Page 41, Appendix V may be looked into for this purpose. Sl. No. 16 (Category II) mentions the job of lorry cleaner as a workman employed in cleaning lorry or cars by washing them down with water. It is no denying the fact that with the nationalisation and centralisation of the coal industry several offices have sprung up with the result that M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited and other constituents of Coal India Ltd. now possesses a fleet of cars, jeeps, trucks and dumpers necessitating employment of not only drivers of such vehicles but also workers for cleaning them. Some cases have cropped up because M/s. B.C.C.L has made no formal recognition of such car cleaners as workmen and they pay them at certain rates per car for leaning them. On behalf of the workmen one such case has been referred to and it is Reference No. 24/80 between Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Area No. III- vs its workman Shri Samsul Khan. A copy of the written statement of the management in Reference case No. 63/81 of Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1) Dhanbad has also been filed to show that the management did not accept the car cleaner as a workman. At the request of the workmen the Reference case No. 24/80 was called for in order to show that the same type of plea was negatived by this Court. It will appear that in that case the same points raised therein have been raised here also. The workman of that case was stopped from work as soon as he demanded that his service should be regularised. In this case he has been stopped from work after the reference was made. The interesting point to note is that the management of M/s. B.C.C.L need staff car cleaners and instead of paying them regular wages what they do is to pay them on the basis of work done by them. This cannot be said to be a contract of work at certain rates. In Coal industry we have two types of workers—time rated and piece rated. Time rated workers are those who are paid according to daily or monthly rates, and piece rated workers are those who are paid according to the volume of work. So instead of the car cleaners being time rated workers they could at best be said to be piece rated workers. But by no stress of imagination it could be said that such car cleaners would be designated as contractors. In this case the workman has examined himself and according to him he was given Note Books (Ext. W. 2) for recording the particulars of the cars cleaned by him. These are seven in numbers covering the period from 1-3-80 to 4-3-82. The position is clear that he was paid according to the number of cars cleaned by him. This is piece rated and nothing else. In view of this position even as a piece rated workman he is a workman of Vikash Bhawan of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. and could not be said to be a contractor.

6. The second point is that the Central Government is not the appropriate Government to make this reference. In this connection the parties fought tooth and nail in Reference case No. 24/80. I took pains to consider the entire matter and it was held by me that the production side of the administration of M/s. B.C.C.L is fully protected by then notification of the Government of India as a 'Controlled Industry'. This Vikash Bhawan deals with the technical aspect of production and finding out the methods of development of a new mine. MW-1 has also admitted that from collieries workers are transferred to Vikash Bhawan and similarly from Vikash Bhawan workers are transferred to the colliery. All the whole they are treated as workmen of M/s. B.C.C.L. The concerned workman is merely a car cleaner and there are instances where a car cleaner working in Area office or Vikash Bhawan have been transferred to the collieries on the same job. It cannot be therefore said that since Vikash Bhawan is not a mine the Central Government has no jurisdiction to make this reference. Shri Bose has vehemently criticised the attitude of Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate for the management. According to him the higher management of M/s. BCCL have instructed their lawyers not to raise the question of jurisdiction of Central Government to make references to the Central Government Industrial Tribunals. Shri Bose submits that Shri Murthy now happens to be the only lawyer of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited having no regard for the instructions issued by the B.C.C.L authorities and he is in the habit of raising the same question for a decision by Tribunals inspite of instructions given to him.

7. I have to observe this is unfortunately the correct position as stated by Shri Bose and such a point taken by him is not consistent with the instructions issued by the higher management of BCCL. Now whatever the position might be

I have no hesitation in holding that the reference was correctly made by the Central Government to this Tribunal and that this Tribunal has jurisdiction to decide the dispute referred to it.

8. Now the question is as to whether the concerned workman should be regularised. Normally a workman of coal industry is regularised in service on completion of 240 days of attendance on the surface and 190 days attendance underground. The case of the concerned workman is that he was appointed as car cleaner in January 1981 and had been working as such till July, 1982. After which he was suddenly stopped from work. Since the management did not take him as a regular employee there is no question of his attendance being marked and so we have not got the benefit of attendance register to show as to how many days he has worked in a particular year. But, it is apparent that he has worked for more than 4 years before he was stopped from work. Four years is a long duration and even as a piece rated worker he should have been regularised. The simple prayer is that he should be regularised in category I although the wage board recommendation, quoted above has put a car cleaner in category II. It means that the concerned workman has demanded less than what he could get.

9. Shri S. Bose has referred to 1980 Lab. I.C. 1646 to stress a point that the concerned workman cannot be allowed to suffer and he has to be paid the minimum wages admissible in the coal industry. Their Lordship of the Supreme Court in the aforesaid case strongly held this point and came to the conclusion that although the workmen were contractor's men, the principal employer being the Government of India was bound to pay the minimum wages. Shri Bose has contended that even according to the workmen's case was paid less than Rs. 200 per month which is far below the wages prescribed for category I mazdoors. According to him the concerned workman has demanded the minimum wages of category I and it cannot be said to be unjustified.

10. On consideration of the entire case I must hold that the Car Cleaner Shri Raju Prasad is entitled to be regularised in service as Car Cleaner and has to be fixed in category I. He certainly made a demand to be regularised and raised an industrial dispute. He was stopped from work when the reference was made. I think it will be in fitness of things that he should get category I wages w.e.f. 20-11-81 when this Tribunal received this reference from the Central Government for adjudication.

11. The reference is therefore answered as below :

The demand of the workmen of Vikash Bhawan of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post office Jharia, District Dhanbad that Shri Raju Prasad, Staff Car Cleaner should be treated as an employee of the management and paid wages in category I is justified. As I have stated above Shri Raju Prasad will be entitled to category I wages w.e.f. 20-11-81 with all other emoluments admissible to him.

This is my award.

J. P. SINGH. Presiding Officer.
[No. I-20012(201)/81-D.III(A)]

S.O. 2911.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Continental Coke & Minerals Sandi, P.O. Bharechnagar, District Hazaribagh and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 20th June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3 DHANBAD
Reference No. 14/81

PRESENT :

Shri J. N. Singh, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Continental Coke & Minerals, Sandi, P.O. Bharachnagar, Dist. Hazaribagh.

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri K. K. Moitra, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri J. D. Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal & Minerals.

Dated, the 14th June, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/s 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. I-20012(120)/81-D.III(A)/D.IV(B) dated the 27th April, 1981.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of M/s. Continental Coke and Minerals, Sandi, P.O. Bharechnagar, Dist. Hazaribagh in not paying wages to their workmen engaged for Coke manufacturing as per the rates of wages of Coal Mining Industry envisaged in N.C.W.A II is justified ? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled ?"

2. The case of the workmen is that the management is engaged in the production of hard coke which comes under the purview of Coal Mining Industry. There are other Coal Mining Industries which also incidentally manufacture hard coke and all such Companies such as Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Eastern Coal Ltd., Eastern Coalfields Ltd., Central Coalfields Ltd., Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd., and others are also producing hard coke and all of them are paying wages to their workmen in accordance with the wage structure as per N.C.W.A-II. It is submitted that the present management is not paying the wages to their workmen in accordance with the said agreement which is illegal and unjustified. It is further submitted that in accordance with the principle of equal wages for equal work the concerned workmen are also entitled to wages which are being paid in the same type of industry elsewhere and they cannot be discriminated. It is, therefore, prayed that they should be paid wages in accordance with N.C.W.A-II with effect from 1-1-1979.

3. The case of the management, however, is that the present Reference is not maintainable as the appropriate Government is the State Govt. and not the Central Govt. According to them the job performed by the concerned workmen cannot be said to be a job concerning a mine as the fundamental nature of the business of this establishment is to purchase slack coal from the various collieries through Govt. Agencies, process the said slack coal into hard coke and then sell them in the open market. It is further contended that in the present case there has been no conciliation proceeding at all in as much as in the conciliation the subject matter of conciliation was entirely on a different matter as will appear from the letter of the A.L.C. Hazaribagh and therefore the Reference is all together different from what transpired in the conciliation proceeding.

4. The further defence is that the alleged N.C.W.A-II was a bipartite settlement entered into with the Coal Industry in which the parties were Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd., Coal India Ltd., Central Coalfields Ltd., Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Eastern Coalfields Ltd., Western Coalfields Ltd., and the Singareni Collieries on the one side and their workmen represented by the Indian National Trade Union Congress and other central unions. The management was not a party to the said establishment and hence it is not binding on them as a bipartite settlement only binds the parties to the agreement. It is thus contended that the agreement is not legally binding upon the present management and as it relates to coal mining industry and as the business of the present management is not a coal mining business so the said agreement is not binding at all. It is also their defence that the present dispute is not an industrial dispute but an individual dispute in as

much as neither a section of the workmen as a class nor any union made any common cause nor raised any dispute with the employer whether verbally or in writing regarding the subject in question and further the alleged Colliery Mazdoor Sabha of India (CITU) is not a representative union so far as the establishment is concerned in as much as not a single workman is a member of the alleged union nor they ever authorised this union to raise the present dispute, so this union has got no locus-standi and is a stranger.

5. The union in their rejoinder has stated that as the industry is a controlled industry in pursuance of sub-clause(1) of Clause (a) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act the referring authority is the Central Govt. It is submitted that the industries engaged in the manufacture of production of coal including coke and other derivatives has been declared as controlled industry U/s. 2 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951 and as such the referring authority is the Central Govt. It is further stated in their rejoinder that the very fact that N.C.W.A. is not binding on the employers in as much as he was not a party to this agreement that is why the present dispute was raised by the union because all such establishments which are engaged in the production of coal under different Govt. Companies are paying wages as per N.C.W.A.-II and since the nature of job is the same and identical, there is no reason as to why the workmen of this establishment should also not be paid the same wages.

6. The point for consideration is as to whether the action of the management in not paying the wages to their workmen engaged for coke manufacturing as per the rates of wages of coal mining industry envisaged in N.C.W.A.-II is justified. If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled.

7. It may be mentioned that after the close of the evidence on behalf of the management the union inspite of taking time did not produce any witness nor came to contest the case. No intimation was received on their behalf and Sri J. D. Lal, Advocate who was conducting the case for the union was present in the Court and he submitted that he has got no instruction. In the circumstances, argument on behalf of the management was heard and award was reserved.

8. The contention of the management is that it is a small scale industry engaged in processing of hard coke from slack coal purchased by them from different collieries through Govt. Agencies and this industry is not a mine the referring authority is the State Govt. and not the Central Govt. It is not denied that the fundamental nature of the business of the management is to purchase slack coal from various collieries through Govt. Agencies after making advance payment and the said slack coal is then processed into hard coke and is sold in the market. This fact has also been stated by MW-1 the sole witness examined on behalf of the management. The management has also filed Ext. M-2 series Municipal Licences. Ext. M-3 licence issued by the Chief Inspector of Factories, Bihar and Ext. M-4 is the registration of the industry by the Govt. of Bihar. They have also filed Exts. M-5 to M-8 which are photostat copy of letter, cash receipts, sale bill-cum-delivery orders and cash memos showing that after processing hard coke is sold by them in open market. Evidently the said job thus does not come under the definition of the word 'mine' and hence this establishment cannot be said as a mine.

9. The next question is as to whether it will come under controlled industry or not as in case of a controlled industry the proper authority is the Central Govt. as per Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act. According to the union the industry which produce hard coke has been declared the controlled industry under the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951. Section 2 of the said Act which came into operation on 31-10-1951 would show that in the expedient of public interest the industry specified in the First Schedule was declared to be a controlled industry. The First Schedule would show that coal, coke and their derivatives were included in it. This Act was enacted to provide for the development and regulation of certain industries. Several sections of the Act would show that union got tremendous power of control of scheduled industries. It envisages the establishment

and constitution of a Central Advisory Council and Development Councils and such undertakings has got to be registered. There are also provisions for taking out licences etc. It further appears that by Notification No. SRO 68 dated 3-1-57 the Central Govt. in pursuance of sub-clause (i) of Clause (a) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act has specified for the purposes of that sub-clause controlled industries engaged in the manufacture of production of coal including coke and other derivatives which have been declared as controlled industry U/s 2 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951. There is another Notification under SRO 67 by which the Central Govt. has delegated its power to the State Govt. so far as they relate to the industrial disputes concerning certain industrial establishments mentioned in the Schedule appended thereto. They show that certain industries were specified as controlled industry by the Central Govt. but regarding some of the industries the powers were delegated to the State Govt. No such power was delegated so far as coal or coke industries are concerned. The learned Advocate for the management contended before me that SRO 68 does not apply to his industry which was a small scale industry and in support of it he has referred a ruling of the Calcutta High Court reported in 1958 (I) L.L.J. page 467 (Bharat Glass Works (P) Ltd., and State of Bengal and others).

9a. With due respect to the learned Advocate, in my opinion this ruling does not support him, rather it goes against him. The ruling specifically provides that as soon as an industry has been specified to be a controlled industry the appropriate Govt., becomes the Central Govt. It will however appear that it was observed in the said ruling that while taking further power in respect of a particular industry it was thought necessary to exclude certain establishments for political reasons or economic reasons in which the referring authority was made the State Govt. Regarding coke industry the said power was never delegated to the State Govt. and therefore it must be held that as the industry of the management is a controlled industry the referring authority is the Central Govt. and not the State Govt.

10. The next contention of the management is that the union in this case has got no locus-standi as it does not function nor any of its workmen are members of the said union nor any workman ever authorised the said union to raise the present dispute. In view of the said objection on us lay on the union to prove that they were functioning in the area and that the employees of this establishment are their members or they authorised them to raise the present dispute. The membership register, counter-foils, resolution books or any other paper have not been filed on behalf of the union to controvert the objection raised on behalf of the management. In such circumstances, it must be held that the union in question has got no locus-standi to raise the present dispute.

11. The Reference suffers from other defects also. The term of the reference would show that the question is as to whether the management was justified in not paying wages to their workmen as per wage structure as envisaged in N.C.W.A.-II. The demand of the workmen thus is that they should be paid wages as per N.C.W.A.-II. The question is as to whether any such demand was raised also by the workmen or by the union before the management or before the A.L.C. or not. Ext. M-9 is a letter dated 19-1-1981 written by the A.L.C. to the management and the subject is about the alleged illegal deduction of wages from the entire workers by the management of the hard coke as such M/s. Continental Coke & Minerals, Sandi situated in Hazaribagh District was invited to hold discussion on the above issue. Ext. M-10 is the reply given by the management to the A.L.C. Thus, from the above letter of the A.L.C. it will appear that the dispute between the parties was regarding illegal deduction of wages from the workers. It did not envisage that the demand was for payment as per N.C.W.A.-II. Now if any amount was deducted from the wages of the workmen the proper course for them was to move the Payment of Wages Court or to file a petition U/S 33(c)(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Thus it is clear that no industrial dispute was raised by the union or the workmen regarding payment as per N.C.W.A.-II. It is well settled that if no demand is made, there cannot be

any industrial dispute and the Tribunal cannot go beyond the terms of Reference.

12. There is also another aspect of the matter. It is also well settled in Sindhu Resettlement Corporation Ltd., and Industrial Tribunal of Gujarat and others reported in Vol. 7 S.C.L.J. page 792 that when no demand is made before the management, there can be no industrial dispute and hence there can be no Reference at all. In this particular case there is no evidence that any demand was ever made either by the workmen or by the union before the management raising any dispute. MW-1 has denied that demand was ever made before the management. In this view of the matter also the present Reference is not maintainable.

13. Lastly it will appear that the N.C.W.A-II was a bipartite settlement entered into by the coal industry and certain unions. Admittedly the present management was not a party to it. It is admitted by the union in their rejoinder that the said agreement is not binding on the present management. It is also well settled that bipartite settlements are binding on the parties to the settlement. In such circumstances as it is not binding on the present management, they are not legally bound to pay the wages as provided in the said settlement.

14. Considering these, I hold that the action of the management as challenged by the union is not illegal or unjustified and in such circumstances the workmen are not entitled to any relief.

15. The award is given accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012(120)/81-D. III (A)/D. IV(B)]

S.O. 2912 —In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jaykaynagar Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Limited, P. O. Jaykaynagar, Distt. Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 37/82

PRESENT :

Shri J. N. Singh, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Jaykaynagar Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P. O. Jaykaynagar, Distt. Burdwan.

AND

Their workman

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.
For the Workman.—Shri C. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

STATE : West Bengal.

Dated the 13th June, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)(d) of the Indus-
409 GI/83-3

trial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-19012(83)/81-D. IV(B) dated the 23rd April, 1982.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Jaykaynagar Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P. O. Jaykaynagar, Dist. Burdwan in not regularising Shri Gaffer Mia, in clerical Gr. II with effect from 3-3-1978, the day from which he is working in that grade, is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?"

2. On 9-6-1983 both the parties have filed a joint petition of compromise with a prayer to pass an award in terms of the settlement.

3. I have gone through the terms of the settlement and it is beneficial for the workman.

4. Accordingly the award is passed in terms of the settlement which shall form part of the award.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-19012(83)/81-D. IV(B)]

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 3, DHANBAD

In the matter of Ref. No. 37 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Jaykaynagar Colliery of Eastern Coalfields Limited, P.O. Jaykaynagar, Dist. Burdwan.

AND

Their Workman

The above employers as well as the workmen most respectfully beg to submit jointly as follows :—

1. That the employers as well as the workmen have mutually negotiated the matter and have come to an amicable overall settlement of the same on the following terms and conditions :—

(a) That the Management shall regularise Sri Gaffer Mia, the workman concerned, as Clerk Grade-II w.e.f. 1-1-83 in N.C.W.A. II pay scale of the post namely Rs. 508-23-692-29-808 on the initial pay of Rs. 508 per month.

(b) That for the period 3-3-78 to 31-12-82 the Management shall pay to Sri Gaffer Mia 50 per cent of the difference of wages between what he had already been paid and the wages as admissible on the minimum of the pay scale of Clerk Gr. II i.e. Rs. 378 p.m. from 3-3-78 to 31-12-78 and Rs. 508 p.m. from 1-1-79 to 31-12-82.

(c) That Sri Gaffer Mia shall receive from the Management the payment as indicated in Sub-Para (b) above in full and final settlement of his claims in this reference.

(d) That in regard to seniority of Sri Gaffer Mia in the post of Clerk Gr. II, this will be reckoned from 1-1-1983.

(e) That the employers as well as the workmen agree that this is an overall settlement of all the claims of the workmen arising out of his reference and it is in full and final settlement of the same.

2. That the employers as well as workmen consider that the above agreement is fair and just to both the parties.

In view of the above, the employers and the workmen jointly pray that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to accept this joint petition and give an award in terms thereof.

(G. P. Goswami),

Vice-President,

Colliery Mazdoor Sabha of India (CTU),

P. O. Jaykaynagar, Dist. Burdwan.

For & on behalf of workman.

Agent,

Jaykaynagar (R) Colly.

P. O. Jaykaynagar,
(Burdwan).

For & on behalf of Employer

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3,
DHANBAD

Reference No. 19/81

PRESENT :

Shri J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Continental Coke & Minerals, Sandi, P.O. Bharech nagar, Dist. Hazaribagh.

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri K. K. Moitra, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Sri J. D. Lal, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coke & Minerals.

Dated, the 13th June, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/s. 101(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. I-20012(6) 81-D.III(A)/D.IV(B) dated the 13th April, 1981.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. Continental Coke and Minerals, Village Sandi, P.O. Bharechnagar, Dist. Hazaribagh in stopping 58 workmen as detailed in the annexure with effect from 28-9-1980 is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

ANNEXURE

Sl.No.	Name	Father's name	Designation
1.	Sri Dand Ansari	S/o. Molbu Ansari	Fireman
2.	Sri Rahim Ansari	S/o. Gulam Rasul Ansari	Trammer
3.	Sri M. Ali Hussain	S/o. Md. Kitik	Fireman
4.	Sri Sarjoo Rabidas	S/o. Dhuma Rabidas	Fireman
5.	Sri Suleman Ansari	S/o. Kitik Ansari	Fireman
6.	Sri Hamid Ansari	S/o. Kadir Ansari	Fireman
7.	Sri Md. Refque	S/o. Setu Ansari	Fireman
8.	Sri Khartmali	S/o. Barhan Mistry	Fireman
9.	Sri Jasmuddin	S/o. Md. Ali	Trammer
10.	Sri Md. Hussain	S/o. Ramjan Ali	Fireman
11.	Sri Puran Mahto	S/o. Jhari Mahto	Trammer
12.	Sri Tejo Rabidas	S/o. Mahavir Rabidas	Trammer
13.	Sri Hanif Ansari	S/o. Fursati Ansari	Fireman
14.	Sri Noor Mohammed	S/o. Md. Ali	Fireman
15.	Sri Ratnood Munda	S/o. Sukhram Uraon	Fireman
16.	Sri Lalu Munda	S/o. Nankoo Munda	Loader
17.	Sri Pusuwa Orawn	S/o. Mahangu Orown	Loader
18.	Sri Gudani Ram	S/o. Imti Lerla Ram	Gen. Mazdoor
19.	Sri Lalo Oraon	S/o. Birsa Oraon	Loader
20.	Sri Jaikumar Koth	S/o. Mahender Koth	Loader
21.	Sri Kallu Koth	S/o. Budhram Koth	Stocker
22.	Sri Jhagroo Sao	S/o. Kanhaij Sao	Loader
23.	Sri Bhukhoo Mahio	S/o. Righu Mahto	Lickageman
24.	Sri Baluwa Munda	S/o. Charan Munda	Loader
25.	Sri Ganjo Bhujan	S/o. Chawntan Bhujan	Loader
26.	Sri Begalal Bhujan	S/o. Mangra Bhujan	Loader
27.	Sri Jaduwa Bhujan	S/o. Annit Bhujan	Loader

1	2	3	4
28.	Sri Berjoo Munda	S/o. Mogal Munda	Loader
29.	Sri Mahra Manjhi	S/o. Nama Manjhi	Loader
30.	Sri Krishna Mehta	S/o. Raghunath Mehta	Loader
31.	Sri Ish Mohammed	S/o. Sahab Hussain	Trammer
32.	Sri Md. Ali Buddique	S/o. Late Md. Raju	Bhhatta Mistry
33.	Sri Dahu Das	S/o. Taken Das Lohar	Mistry
34.	Sri Saukat Ali	S/o. Maniruddin	Elect. Helper
35.	Sri Dinesh Rajbar	S/o. Maghanath Rajbar	Welder Fitter
36.	Sri Nageshwar Rajbar	S/o. Maghanath Rajbar	G.M.
37.	Smt. Chaiti Kothi	W/o. Krishna Koth	Stocker
38.	Smt. Bumitra Devi	W/o. Jagdish Rabidas	Stocker.
39.	Smt. Bimali Devi	W/o. Ramhanash Rabidas	G.M.
40.	Smt. Sohari Devi	W/o. Birjoo Munda	Loader
41.	Smt. Rupa Devi	W/o. Moti Oran	Loader
42.	Smt. Budhan Devi	W/o. Mangar Munda	Loader
43.	Smt. Sugan Kumari	W/o. Sukar	Loader
44.	Smt. Ritani Kumar	W/o. Lokya Orawn	Loader
45.	Smt. Budhni Devi	W/o. Mangar Orawn	Loader
46.	Smt. Shanti Devi	W/o. Jhirga Orawn	Loader
47.	Smt. Mangari Devi	W/o. Dutta Munda	Loader
48.	Smt. Sucho Kumari	D/o. Bira Munda	Loader
49.	Smt. Sukarmani Kumari	W/o. Buda Munda	Loader
50.	Smt. Shanti Devi	W/o. Jaikaran Koth	Loader
51.	Smt. Koyali Devi	W/o. Deglal Bhuiyan	Loader
52.	Sri Hamid	S/o. Jakir Ansari	Loader Mistry
53.	Sri Basudeo Body	S/o. Rohan Body	Loader
54.	Sri Rijwa Body	W/o. Bodha Body	Stocker
55.	Sri Baijnath Pandey	S/o. Sanjoo Pandey	Munshi
56.	Smt. Sukro Kumari	W/o. Jhari Pawan	Loader
57.	Sri Bideciya Ruri	S/o. Bunshi Ruri	G.M.
58.	Sri Shyam Khan	S/o. Rabi Khan	Guard.

2. The case of the workmen is that they are permanent workmen of the management and are working continuously for more than 2 years in the capacity mentioned against their respect names in the schedule. It is alleged that the management has been indulging in unfair labour practice by not paying proper wages and other wages to them against which they formed a new union under the name of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha of India in the beginning of 1980. The management got annoyance and they refused work to the concerned workmen with effect from 28-9-1980. It is submitted that the establishment of the management is engaged in the production of hard coke and the union made several representations before the management as also before the Labour Department authorities but nothing came out and then the present dispute was raised. The further submission is that the action of the management in stopping these concerned workmen from work is illegal, arbitrary and unjustified and hence the concerned workmen are entitled to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. The defence of the management, however, is that their establishment viz. Continental Coke & Minerals is not a mine as it does not excavate or extract or does any of the work connected with any mineral. According to them the fundamental nature of the business of the establishment is to purchase slack coal from various collieries through the Govt. Agencies, process the said slack coal into hard coke and then it is sold in the open market. For purchase of slack coal the payment to the Govt. is made in advance and the delivery is allowed from the collieries against showing of payment of chalan and it has nothing to do with mines. It is, therefore, submitted that in the above circumstances the appropriate Govt. to refer the dispute is the State Govt. and not the Central Govt. It is further stated that the alleged dispute is not an industrial dispute but an individual dispute in as much as neither a section of the workmen as a class nor any union raised any dispute with the employer

whether verbally or in writing and as no dispute was ever made with the management, there can be no industrial dispute in the eyes of law. It is also stated that the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha of India has got no locus-standi to raise the present dispute as it does not function in this establishment and not a single workman is a member of the alleged union nor any of them even authorised the said union to raise the present dispute and that the said union is a stranger and an outsider. Lastly it is submitted that there was never any relationship of employer and employee between the management and the concerned workman and the concerned workman never worked under the management nor they were ever employed a such and hence the question of stopping of their work does not arise at all. It is submitted that they were all contractor's men with whom the management had got no concern.

4. On the above grounds it is submitted that the Reference be decided in favour of the management.

5. The workmen, however, in their earlier written statement did not challenge the contention of the management that the establishment in question is not a mine and that the Central Govt. had no authority to refer the present dispute. In the rejoinder, however, it is stated that the Central Govt. in pursuance of Sub-Clause (i) of Clause (a) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has declared as controlled industry the industries engaged in manufacture and production of coal including coke and other derivates which has been declared as controlled industry U/s. 2 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951 and therefore M/s. Continental Coke & Minerals which manufacture coke is a controlled industry as specified by the Central Govt. and therefore the appropriate Govt. is the Central Govt. It is also submitted that the Central Govt. has notified such industries as controlled industry vide Notification No. SRO 68 dated 5-1-1957 and therefore the appropriate Govt. to refer the dispute is the Central Govt. and not the State Govt.

6. The point for consideration is as to whether the action of the management of M/s. Continental Coke & Minerals in stopping the concerned workman as detailed in the Annexure is justified. If not to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled.

7. It may be stated that the union was contesting the case throughout through their Advocate Sri J. D. Lal. The case was taken up for hearing on 18-5-83 on which date MW-1 was examined to prove certain documents and closed their evidence. On that date the union prayed for time as its witnesses were not available. Accordingly the union was directed to bring witnesses on the next date and as the case had become more than two years old, both the parties were also directed to come ready for argument also after the evidence is closed. On the next date i.e. 8-6-1983 the management came ready with their Advocate but neither the union nor their Advocate appeared nor any intimation was sent to this Tribunal for their absence. In the circumstances the argument on behalf of the management was heard and award was reserved.

8. It is not denied that the fundamental nature of the business of the management is to purchase slack coal from various collieries through Govt. Agencies after making advance payment and the said slack coal is then processed into hard coke and is sold in the market. This fact has not been denied in the written statement filed on behalf of the workman. The said fact is also proved from the evidence of MW-1 the sole witness examined on behalf of the management. It is also in evidence of the management that their industry is registered as a Small Scale Industry under the Factories Act by the Chief Inspector of Factories, Bihar and they have filed licences which are marked Exts. M-3 & M-4. Ext. M-2 series are the municipal licences issued to this industry. Ext. M-5 is a prayer to the Coal India for supply of coal to this industry. Ext. M-6 series are the demand drafts. Ext. M-7 series are the cash memos and Ext. M-8 series are the bill-cum-delivery order which show that advance payment is made by this industry to the Govt. and on that basis slack coal is supplied to them by Coal India and its subsidiaries and after the slack coal is processed into hard coke they are sold in open market. The contention of the management is that as the above nature of business is not connected with excavation or other processes as defined in the Mines Act for defining the word 'mine' and hence as this establishment is not a mine the Central Govt. is not the appropriate Govt. to refer the present dispute and that the dispute should have been referred to by the State Govt. and on that score alone the present Reference is not maintainable.

9. The union in their written statement does not challenge the contention of the management that this industry is not a mine but according to the rejoinder filed by them it is a controlled industry and if any dispute in any industry specified as controlled industry the appropriate authority is the Central Govt. The union has also referred to Section 2 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951 as also notification No. SRO 68 dated 5-1-1957. The contention of the management, however, is that the said notification is not applicable to their industry. It is therefore to be considered as to whether the job performed by the industry in question can be said to be a controlled industry or not. Section 2(i)(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act has defined the word appropriate Govt. and it includes any such controlled industry as may be specified in this behalf by the Central Govt. The Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951 in Section 2 has declared that its expedient in the public interest that the union should take under its control the industries specified in the First Schedule. Certain industries have been mentioned which has been declared to be the industries taken under its control by the Govt. by this Act. It includes coal, coke and other derivatives and has been shown under the head 'Fuel'. This Act came into operation on 31-10-1951 and it is an Act to provide for the development and regulation of certain industries and is a Central Act. There are several sections in the Act which show that the union by this Act got tremendous power of control of scheduled industries. It envisages the establishment and constitution of a Central Advisory Council and Development Councils and such undertakings has to be registered. There are provisions for taking out licences etc. It further appears that by Notification SRO 68 the Central Govt. in pursuance of Sub-Clause (i) Clause (a) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act has specified for the purpose of that sub-clause controlled industries engaged

in the manufacture and production of coal including coke and other derivatives which have been declared as controlled industry U/s. 2 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951. There is another notification under SRO 67 it delegates the power of the Central Govt. to the State Govt. so far as they relate to the industrial disputes concerning seven industrial establishments mentioned in the schedule appended thereto. It shows that certain industries were specified as controlled industries by the Central Govt. but some of those industries the powers were delegated by the Central Govt. to the State Govt. and it was notified that the State Govt. will be the appropriate Govt. for the said authority.

10. The learned Advocate for the management has referred before me a ruling of the Calcutta High Court reported in 1958 (I) L.L.J. page 467 (Bharat Glass Works (P) Ltd. and State of West Bengal and others) and on the basis of the said ruling it was argued on their behalf that the industry in question is not a controlled industry as specified by the Central Govt. and hence the proper authority is the State Govt.

11. With due respect to the learned Advocate of the management I may mention that this ruling is against him and it supports the case of the union. This ruling specifically provides that as soon as an industry has been specified to be a controlled industry the appropriate Govt. becomes the Central Govt. From a perusal of this ruling it will also appear that it was held that while taking over power in respect of a particular industry it was thought necessary to exclude certain establishments for political reasons or economic reasons and the notification demonstrate that in the case of controlled industries generally the referring authority is the State Govt. but specified in the proper manner the power of reference is transferred to the Central Govt. In this particular case the manufacture and production of coal including coke and other derivatives has been declared and specified as controlled industry U/s. 2 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act and in such circumstances the industry carried on by the present management the proper authority to refer the dispute is the Central Govt. and not the State Govt.

12. The next objection on behalf of the management is that the present union has got no locus-standi to raise the present dispute as it does not function nor any of the workmen is a member of the said union nor any member authorised the Executive Committee of the said union to raise the present dispute. In view of the said allegation made on behalf of the management it was the duty of the union to prove that they function and the employees of this establishment are their members and that the workmen authorised this union to raise the present dispute. The membership register, counter-foils and receipts or resolution book have not been filed by the union in support of their stand. In fact not a chit of paper nor any oral evidence has been adduced to controvert the plea taken by the management and as the union has failed to prove that they were authorised to raise the present dispute, the Reference is not maintainable.

13. The next contention is that no dispute was ever raised by the workmen or the union before the management. It is now well settled in the ruling reported in Vol. 7 S.C.L.J. page 792 (Sindhu Resettlement Corporation Ltd. and Industrial Tribunal of Gujarat and others) that when no demand is made before the management there can be no Reference at all and unless demand is made before the management there can be no industries dispute. MW-1 has stated that no demand was ever made before the management. In this view of the matter the present Reference is not tenable.

14. So far as the merit is concerned MW-1 has stated that these concerned workmen were never their employees and there was no relationship of employer and employee and so the question of stopping them from work did not arise at all. In support of it the management has also filed the weekly wage register from 1-4-80 to 31-3-81 marked Ext. M-1. It mentions the names of the workers employed in this industry but the name of any of the concerned workmen does not appear there. There is nothing to disbelieve the authenticity of this register. None of the workmen have even come to the witness box to depose that they were engaged by the management and were stopped work from a certain date. The onus lay on the workmen to prove that they were employed by the management, but they have failed to prove so. Thus the union fails on merits also.

15. On the findings arrived at above, I hold that the union has got no case and the action of the management as challenged cannot be said to be unjustified or illegal. In the circumstances the workmen are not entitled to an relief.

16. The award is given accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-20012(6)/81-D.III(A) D.IV(B)]

New Delhi, the 29th June, 1983

S.O. 2914.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employees in relation to the management of Sodepur Central Workshop of Meers Eastern Coalfields Limited, Post Office Sunderchak, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1983.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
CALCUTTA**

Reference No. 38 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Sodepur Central Workshop of M/s. ECL, P. O. Sunderchak, Distt. Burdwan;

AND

Their Workman.

PRESENT :

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers.—Mr. B. N. Lala, Advocate with Mr. S. K. Chanda, Senior Personnel Officer.

On behalf of Workman.—Mr. D. L. Sen Gupta, Advocate.

STATE : West Bengal.

INDUSTRY : Coal

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has referred the following dispute for adjudication vide Order No. L-19012(27)/81-L. IV(B) dated 18th September, 1981;

"Whether the management of Sodepur Central Workshop of M/s. E.C.L., P. O. Sunderchak, District Burdwan (West Bengal) was justified in superannuating Shri Jit Singh, Tyndal Zamadar, with effect from 1-7-1980 ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?"

2. According to the management records Jit Singh was born in 1920. All these documents were proved by MW-1 born in 1928. Admittedly the age of superannuation is 60 years (vide Ext. M-8 also). His date of superannuation would be 1988 if his case is accepted. On the other hand if his birth in 1920 is accepted, he was then rightly made to retire w.e.f. 1 July, 1980 through the letter of superannuation (Ext. M-1 dated 10 May 1980). The question is which version is correct. The management relies on Ext. M-2, M-1 and M-7 in support of their case that Jit Singh was born in '920. All these documents were proved by M-1 Mr. N. I. Khan a Senior Executive Engineer of the ECL. Ext. M-2 is the service card of Jit Singh issued by the erstwhile management namely, Bengal Coal Company on 19 March 1957. The year of the birth in this document is 1920. A very look of it shows that it is a genuine document. Sri Sen Gupta appearing for the Union argued that it was prepared in March 1957 and so it is a subsequent document. He further submitted that it was in English which could not be read by Jit Singh. In my opinion these are no grounds to reject this document. No valid ground

has been shown to disbelieve it. I rely upon this document. Another important document is Ext. M-3 which is an entry in B form register of the Sodepur Central Workshop, maintained by the management under the Mines Act. It contains the details of the concerned workman, namely, Jit Singh. It bears the signature of Jit Singh. The year of birth of Jit Singh recorded in this register is 1920. The Sl. No. of Jit Singh in this register is 164 which is Ext. M-3. The B form register is the true copy of the B form register of the old Company. That is the evidence of MW-1. It has been signed by the dealing clerk who was present here on the date of deposition of MW-1. The witness said that the old B form register was under the custody of the custodian general. Sri Sen Gupta vehemently argued that B form register filed by the management should be held unreliable because the B form register of the old company has not been produced. The contention has no substance. That is under the custody of the Custodian General. The management has produced its own B form register which is in respect of all its workers of the Colliery in question and which is maintained under the Mines Act. The relevant entry has been signed by Jit Singh himself in Gurumukhi and it is not now open to him to challenge the entry as in-correct. The signature is not denied. It is admitted. I rely upon the entry Ext. M-3 which shows the year of birth as 1920. Ext. M-6 is the increment list of Sodepur workshop employees of 18 December 1972. At page 8 the name of Jit Singh appears and his birth year is 1920. A similar document of 1920 (Ext. M-7), in which the name of Jit Singh appears in Sl. No. 25994 shows his year of birth as 1920. These two documents also are of the quondam owner. There is no reason to disbelieve them. I accept them as reliable. Thus three documents (Exts. M-2, M-6 and M-7) are of the erstwhile management and one document Ext. M-3 entry B form register which has been signed by the concerned workman Jit Singh himself is of the management. It is maintained under the Mines Act. All these four documents clearly prove that the year of birth of Jit Singh is 1920. I fully rely on them and hold that the correct year of birth of Jit Singh is 1920 for the purposes of his retirement from service.

3. The Union rely on three documents Ext. W-1, W-2 and W-3 all proved by the concerned workman Jit Singh himself. None of them is reliable. Ext. W-1 is the identity card issued by the erstwhile management. In this card the year of birth of Jit Singh is '1928'. From a mere look of it, it seems that the figure '1928' is over written and the figure '8' is interpolated. If I am permitted to conjecture I will say that '0' appears to have been converted into 8 and then the whole figure was rewritten as 1928 so that the ink on '8' may not look different from '1928' viz the figures preceding '8'. However the whole figure '1928' is in different ink from the rest writing on Ext. W-1. The suggestion made by Sri B N Lala Counsel for the management to the effect that the figure '1928' is in different ink and is over-written is correct. Jit Singh WW-1, says in his evidence that it is sealed but that is not a fact. It is not sealed. Sri B. N. Lala took out the photo from the unsealed cover and showed that it was not sealed. I do not believe it. In my opinion Ext. W-1 was interpolated by some interested person. Ext. W-2 is the affidavit of Harbans Singh the own brother of Jit Singh. Harbans Singh is still in service of the ECL. He has sworn affidavit that he was born in 1925 and Jit Singh was born as 2 January 1928. Harbans Singh has not come to the witness box. He being his own brother is highly interested. Moreover the date of superannuation is fixed with reference to the date or year of birth given by the employer concerned at the time of appointment. So the mere fact that an elder brother is in service does not mean that the year of birth of the younger brother given to the management is wrong. The affidavit Ext. W-2 is, thus, of no value and it carries no weight. The third document relied upon by Shri Sen Gupta is Ext. W-3 which is Form A of Coal Mines Provident Fund. It bears no stamp of the Coal Mines Provident Fund Office. No one from the office came to depose. It does not bear the photograph at the space meant for it. Jit Singh WW-1 says that he received it from a member of the union. Sri Sen Gupta appearing for the Union says that it came from office to office when this tribunal had passed

order for its production. It may be noted that the witness does not say that he brought it here. What he says is that he received it from a member of the Union. The possibility of procuring it through some member of an Union, cannot be ruled out. It may be that some old form has been used for purposes of this case. Be that as it may, it is quite clear that this is a wholly unreliable document. It is not known under what circumstances it came into being. The ink appears to be fresh. Sri Sen Gupta drew my attention to the back of the page where there is signature of some one as manager of Bengal Coal Co. Ltd. None has proved this signature. I do not rely upon this document. I do not believe Jit Singh the concerned workman who says that he was born in 1928. The year of birth in Ext. W-3 is "1929 approximately". It is obvious that some one else filled up this document having no idea of the exact year of birth of Jit Singh. The definite case of the Union is that Jit Singh was born in 1928. If so, why the year of birth "1929 approximately" is written in Ext W-3 ? For all these reasons I disbelieve Ext W-3 and hold that it is not a genuine document.

4. Sri Sen Gupta suggested to MW-1 that the medical board 1980 gave the view that Jit Singh had not reached the age of 60 and he was 52 or 53 years of age. The suggestion is unfounded. It appears from the evidence of MW-2 H C Panigrahi a Sr. Specialist physician of Sanctoria Hospital that he and others as members of the medical board examined Jit Singh on 20-6-1980 in order to see whether he was fit to continue as per provisions of NCWA-II. Dr. P P Bhattacharya, Dr. B N Lala, Sri P C Banerjee the Sr. Personnel Officer and MW-2 were members of the board. Only fitness was to be examined. It was not an age determination committee. They has not to assess the age and they did not assess the age. No question was put by the Union to MW-2 on the point of age. Jit Singh and others were directed to appear before the board by letter dated 14 June 1980 (Ext. M-10). Jit Singh was to reach his age of superannuation on 30 June 1980. At his own request he was medically examined. He and some others were found fit. Some were found unfit (Ext M-9). This medical examination, therefore, has no relevance on the point of time of birth of Jit Singh. It may be pointed that there is a provision in the NCWA-II (See para 10.4.3) that If a workman is found permanently unfit and he is declared unfit by the medical board of Company's doctor, then one of his dependents will get the employment and the workman found unfit will be retired. It is in that connection that Jit Singh requested the management to send him for medical examination and then the management on sympathetic ground sent him for that (See MW-1). So the point raised by Sri Sen Gupta in the suggestion to MW-1 has no force.

5. Sri B. N. Lala appearing for the management cited two decisions, one of Andhra Pradesh High Court (1982 Lab IC 297) and the other of the Patna High Court (1983 Lab IC 162) to support his contention that no workman can go behind the contractual date of appointment as recorded at the join of his appointment. As I have decided the year of birth on evidence on record it is not necessary to discuss these decisions.

6. For the foregoing reasons, my concluded award is that the year of birth of Jit Singh as 1920 is correct, that Jit Singh the Tyndal Tandoor attained his age of Superannuation on 30th June 1980 and so the management of Sodepur Central Workshop of M/s. E.C.L. P.O. Sunderchax District Burdwan (West Bengal) was justified in superannuating him, with effect from 1 July 1980. It follows that the concerned workman namely Jit Singh is not entitled to any relief.

Dated, Calcutta.

The 15th June, 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-19012(27)/81-D. IV(B)]

S.O. 2915.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhanora Colliery of Eastern Coalfields Limited, Post Office Charanpur, District Burdwan (W.B.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 25th June, 1983.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
CALCUTTA**

Reference No. 18 of 1983

Employers in relation to the management of Bhanora Colliery of Eastern Coalfields Limited.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers.—Mr. K. P. Chakraborty, An employee of the Colliery.

On behalf of Workmen.—Mr. Nur Ali Kha, Organising Secretary of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal

AWARD

The dispute as to whether the action of the Agent, Bhanora Colliery of E.C. Ltd. P O Charanpur (Burdwan) in placing S/Shri Raksha Pashi, Bajinath Gope, Janai Chamar and Bismilla Khan who were getting Loader's Sirdari Commission in Clerical grade-II and subsequently placing them in clerical grade III as Tub-Checkers with effect from 21-7-80 is justified and if not, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled, was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour by their Order No. L-19012/80/82-D. IV(B) dated 4th March 1983.

2. The case was fixed for hearing on 15-6-1983, i.e. to-day. When the case was taken up for hearing the parties filed a petition of compromise and prayed for an award in terms thereof. In the circumstances, an award is passed in terms of the compromise which will form part of this Award as Annexure 'AA'.

Dated, Calcutta.

The 15th June, 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-19012(80)/82-D. IV (B)]

A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer
ANNEXURE 'A'

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CALCUTTA**

Re : 18/83 (in respect of S/Shri Racha Passi, Bajinath Gope, Janai Chamar and Bismilla Khan of Bhanora Colliery).

The Employer most respectfully beg to submit memorandum of settlement dated 10-6-83 in duplicate concerning the dispute under reference for passing necessary Award relating thereto so that the Employers may be able to implement the terms of settlement accordingly.

The dispute in respect of Sri Bismilla Khan has been dropped by the concerned union (Sri Khan has been superannuated from his services w.e.f. 3-10-82).

Dated.—15-6-83.

For & on behalf of
Employers.
Agent.
Bhanora Colliery
Eastern Coalfields Ltd.
Sripur Area.

Memorandum of settlement in the industrial dispute on allegation discrimination in proper grading of 3 Ug. Tub checkers of Bhanora colliery between the Jt. Secretary, C.M.C. (HMS) and the Management of Sripur Area of Eastern Coalfields Limited.

PARTIES PRESENT :

Representing the employer of Sripur Area of E. C. Ltd.

Sri M. N. Singh, Personnel Manager, Sripur Area.

Representing the workman

Sri Sakti Pada Chatterjee

Jt. Secretary
C.M.C. (HMS).

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE

Six Ug. Loaders of Bhanora Colliery were converted to Ug. Tub Checkers in Clerical Gr. II with effect from 11-2-1982. After sometime that office order was amended on the ground that Tub Checkers as per Wage Board Recommendation are in Clerical Grade II C.M.C. (HMS) union objected to this and the matter was referred to the Conciliation where it ended in failure. The matter was subsequently referred to Central Government Industrial Tribunal. In the meantime a discussion with the union was held with the union for settling the matter bilaterally, and the matter was ultimately resolved on the following terms :

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

- Out of the six Ug. Tub Checkers S/Shri Raksha Pashi, Baijnath and Janai Chamar will be placed in Clerical Grade II as Pit Clerks.
- Basic of S/Shri Raksha Pashi and Baijnath shall be fixed at Rs. 721 per month and of Sri Janai Chamar at Rs. 692 per month in Clerical Gr. II.
- Effect of the above fixation will be given from December, 1982.
- The matter of arrear wages in respect above persons shall be discussed by with the General Manager, Sripur Area by the Union and finalise the same.
- On the basis of above bilateral settlement, the parties present agreed to close the case ones for all as full and final settlement of the dispute.

Sd/-

Representing the workman

Witness 1. Sd/-

2. Sd/-

Sd/-

Ref. No. GM/SA/C-6/11/83

Representing the employer.

Dated.—10-6-83.

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1983

कांग आ० 2916.—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 239 के खंड (1) के अनुसार में, निवेश देते हैं कि अन्दमान और निकोबार द्वीप संघ राज्यक्षेत्र के प्रशासक राष्ट्रपति

के नियंत्रण के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के भीतर नियोजनालय (रिक्तियों का अनिवार्य अधिसूचना) प्रधिनियम, 1959 (1959 का 31) के अधीन राज्य सरकार की शक्तियों का प्रयोग और कृत्यों का निर्वहन करेगा।

[सं० डॉ जी ई टी-3(29)/81इमआई (डीई वी)

पौ०आर० रामकृष्णन्, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1983

S.O. 2916.—In pursuance of clause (1) of article 239 of the Constitution, the President hereby directs that the Administrator of the Union territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands shall, subject to the control of the President, exercise the powers and discharge the functions of the State Government under the Employment Exchanges (Compulsory Notification of Vacancies) Act, 1959 (31 of 1959), within the said Union territory.

[No. DGET-3(29)/81-EMI(DEV)]

P. R. RAMAKRISHNAN, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1983

S.O. 2917.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Deluxe Shipping Agency Bombay and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 21st June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1 AT BOMBAY
Reference No. CGIT-22 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to M/s. Deluxe Shipping Agency, Bombay.

AND

Their Workman

APPEARANCES :

For the employer—Mr. M. M. Verma, Advocate.

For the workman—Mr. V. Bhaskaran, Advocate.

STATE : Maharashtra.

INDUSTRY : Ports & Docks

Bombay, the 27th May, 1983

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by order No. L-31012/15/81 D.IV(A) dated the 6th November, 1981, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to M/s. Deluxe Shipping Agency, Bombay, and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the schedule mentioned below :—

SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Messrs Deluxe Shipping Agency, Bombay are justified in terminating the services of Shri K. R. Nair with effect from the 31st July, 1981 ? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?”

2. The workman, K. R. Nair, was employed with the employer on 1-8-1978. According to the workman he was appointed as a general clerk and he was performing the duties

as a general clerk since then. According to the employer, the workman was employed as a peon. The employer denies that he was appointed as a clerk. It is common ground that no letter of appointment was issued at the time of his employment. It is also a common ground that at the time of his employment the workman was drawing a salary of Rs. 300 per month. He was made permanent from February, 1980. According to the employer, he was made permanent in the post of a peon.

3. The workman states in the statement of claim that about ten months after his appointment i.e. on 29-5-1979 he made a representation in writing to the management to make him permanent and revise his salary according to the grade laid down. As there was no response he made a further representation in writing on 1-1-1980. The management, however, did not consider any of his representations. The workman further states that as there was no action from the management on his representations he filed an application before the Central Government Labour Court under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act on or about 8th April 1981, for a sum of Rs. 7441.60, being the difference in wages paid to him and the actual wages due to him. That application was numbered as ICR-441 of 1981. It is alleged by the workman that immediately after the management came to know that he had filed this application he was directed on 15th May, 1981, to leave the office without any ostensible reason and the watchman on duty was instructed not to allow him to enter the office premises. Thereupon, he made a representation on the same day against the said action. As there was no reply he reminded the management again in writing on 26-5-1981.

4. The workman proceeds to say in his statement of claim that by a letter dated 12th June, 1981, he was told, inter alia, to report to duty on any day with a warning that he shall be liable for disciplinary action. The workman by his letter dated 15th June, 1981, replied to the aforesaid letter of the management and resumed duty. He was allowed to work from 15-6-1981 to 18-6-1981 and on 18.6.1981 he was called inside the cabin of J. B. Agarwal and B. B. Agarwal and at that time he was told by B. B. Agarwal that he should come to the office everyday at 10.30 A.M. and sign the muster and then not to remain in the office and the workman was called and ordered in his presence to bring the muster at the entrance and obtain his signature and not to allow him inside the office. The workman states that he protested immediately against these instructions by submitting his protest in writing. On 20-6-1981 the management issued a show-cause notice to him stating therein that this workman remained absent without permission from 16-5-1981 and that he had made false allegations against the management of the firm in his letters sent by him in the month of May and June. It was averred in this notice that staying away from work without reason or sanction of leave was a serious misconduct and that his making false allegations against the management were acts subversive of discipline. The workman, therefore, was asked to show-cause in writing within 24 hours why disciplinary action should not be initiated against him for the alleged acts of misconduct. The workman states that he gave the reply within 24 hours of the receipt of notice in which he denied in categorical terms the allegations contained in the show-cause notice. The workman presented this letter personally to the management on 24-6-1981, but they refused to accept it and therefore the said reply letter was sent by registered post A.D. On 27-6-1981 he made a complaint in writing to the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) at Bombay praying for his intervention. The workman states that on 2-7-1981 the management asked him to work as a peon instead of as a clerk and that too by an oral order. He protested against the said order by a written representation dated 4-7-1981. The workman states that for the first time on 10-7-1981 the management wrote to him stating, inter alia, that he was appointed as a peon and that he should carry out the work of a peon. By another letter of the same date he was asked to say in writing whether he was prepared to work as a peon without protest. On 13-7-1981 he replied that whatever he had submitted on 4-7-1981 was absolutely true. The management by their letter dated 31-7-1981 informed him, inter alia, that "it is difficult that we shall be in a position to continue you in our employment as you are not voluntarily accepting the services of a peon" and further informed him that his services were discharged with immediate effect as there was no agreement between him and them in respect of the nature of work he was required to carry out. The workman was paid one month's wage in lieu

of notice. The workman pointed out that the management had terminated his services after issuing a show-cause notice alleging "acts subversive of discipline" against him. The action of the management, according to the workman, was mala fide and in violation of the principles of natural justice, in discharging him from the service. On these allegations the workman demanded reinstatement in the service with all consequential benefits with retrospective effect as due to a general clerk from the date of wrongful termination.

4. The employer in its written statement stated that as per the terms of the contract between them and the workman he was to serve as a peon and inspite of that he insisted asserting that he was not a peon but a clerk and he was not ready and willing to discharge his functions voluntarily as a peon. The employer had, therefore, had no alternative but to discharge him from the services. The employer denied that the workman was victimised or that its action was mala fide.

5. Now, one of the points strongly urged on behalf of the workman was that here is an employer who does not issue orders of appointment in writing. Since 29-5-1979 he made representations to the management from time to time to revise his salary in the grade of a clerk. In spite of these various representations, according to the workman, it was for the first time on 10-7-1981, that the management wrote to him that he was appointed as a peon and that he should carry out the job of a peon. It was emphasised on behalf of the workman that in spite of his assertion from 29-5-1979 that he was working as a clerk, it was only for the first time that the management stated on 10-7-1981 that he was appointed as a peon. It would, therefore, be proper to refer very briefly to the correspondence on record.

6. It is not in dispute that the workman was appointed in this company on 1-8-1978. According to the workman, he was appointed as a general clerk and according to the management he was appointed as a peon. Admittedly, there was no letter of appointment specifying the post in which the workman was appointed or the conditions of service. The workman wrote a letter to the Managing Partner of the company on 29-5-1979. The workman states in this letter that he has been working as a general clerk for the last ten months to the best of his ability and capacity as a temporary hand. He further stated that the salary which was being paid to him did not enable him to make both ends meet, and requested the Managing Partner to consider his case sympathetically and confirm him in his appointment "with substantial revision of clerical grade as the same is dispensed with your goodself." The workman sent a reminder to this letter on 1-1-1980 stating therein that he has to maintain five kids and had been serving in the establishment for the last one-and-a-half years. It appears that there was no reply from the management. The workman therefore, wrote again on 25-4-1980 to the Managing Partner asserting in that communication that he was put in service as a general clerk in the organisation and that since his appointment it was his privilege to perform his duty with his utmost and sincere co-operation. He added in this letter that he had been carrying out his work in a similar manner up to date, without any delay all routine of the office work such as typing of entire sets of R/L accounts, the office work such as typing of entire sets of R/L accounts, outdoor duties connected with the office and its sister concerns. The workman added in this letter that he had not given any cause for complaints and that he was working to the satisfaction of the management. He complained in this letter that his seniors were allowed to supersede him. The management replied his letter by their communication dated 23-5-1980. It begins with the recitals that they had gone through his (workman's) lengthy narration dated 25-4-1980 and they had given due consideration to the submissions made therein by him. With regard to his work this letter states:—

"As regards to your work, it is found that it is not upto the mark. Recently it was reported to us that when you were asked to attend to some urgent work by Mr. Chopkar of Export Division you did not attend to it. We would like to have your explanation for this act."

In his said letter dated 25-4-1980 the workman had stated that he was coming to the place of his work earlier in the morning and leaving the office late in the evening during the past 22

months of his service. In reply to that this communication of the management stated that his coming early and sitting late may be for his personal work. It is further stated :—

"It appears that you are not in good health and as such not able to concentrate on your work. We would like to have a medical certificate from doctor, for our consideration."

The communication ends by saying that after receipt of the above information the management may give consideration to his petition taking into account the report of his superiors regarding his work. The workman had stated in his letter dated 25-4-1980 that he was also working for the sister concerns of the establishment. The management stated in their reply that they had no sort of any sister concerns and, therefore, his statement to that effect was baseless. It may be mentioned that the assertion of the workman in his letter dated 25-4-1980 that he was put in service as a general clerk and that he was typing certain documents was not contradicted.

7. We have then a letter dated 17-2-1981 delivered to the workman by the management. This letter states that it was reported by his superiors that the work entrusted to him was not being handled by him properly and as per their instructions; and that it causes considerable delay in completing the documents. The workman was informed that he was, therefore, suspended from the duty for two days. The workman by his immediate reply dated 18-2-1981 protested by saying that he was not asked even orally his explanation about the complaint allegedly made against him by his superiors nor the details of the report of the superiors were supplied to him. He informed the management that the order of suspension was "basically illegal and substantially cruel". He requested that the suspension order be withdrawn. It was submitted on behalf of the workman that the tenor of the letter dated 17-2-1981 sent by the management to the workman shows that he was not doing the work of a peon only but that he must be doing the work of a clerk. There is, in my opinion some substance in this submission.

8. It appears that this workman filed an application before the Central Government Labour Court No. 1, Bombay, under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act on or about 8-4-1981, for a sum of Rs. 7,000 and odd being the difference in wages paid to him and the actual wages due to him, contending that he was working as a senior clerk and he was not paid for the work of that post. The workman stated in his statement of claim that after the management came to know about this application, on 15th May, 1981, he was directed to leave the office without any ostensible reason and the watchman on duty was instructed not to allow him to enter the office premises. The workman has placed on record a copy of the letter sent to the management on the same day i.e. 15-5-1981 complaining about that oral order of the management asking him to leave the office, and requesting the management to allow him to perform his normal duties with immediate effect. The workman sent another letter dated 26th May 1981, requesting the management to allow him to continue his duties. The management sent a reply to the workman's letter dated 15-5-1981 on 12-6-1981 stating therein that no one had forcibly directed him to leave the office since 15th May, 1981 and that no watchman had been instructed not to allow him to enter the office. It was stated in this letter that the workman himself walked out of the office premises for entirely extraneous reasons best known to him and that he continued to remain absent for a period exceeding ten days which is a major misconduct. This letter ends by saying:—

"You are at liberty to report to duty on any day but you shall be liable for disciplinary action. You may not camouflage yourself by stating that you have been forcibly turned out and you are warned not to make such false and pretentious allegations."

In his letter dated 15-6-1981 the workman denied that he had made false statement or allegations in his letters on this subject. He stated in that letter that he was in need of employment and he requested the management to allow him to resume his duties.

9. The workman states in the statement of claim that he resumed his duty on 15-6-1981 and was allowed to work

upto 18-6-1981. However, he was called inside the cabin of J. B. Agarwal and B. B. Agarawal; that J. Agarawal was not in the cabin then, B.B. Agarawal and K. B. Agarawal then told him to come to the office every day at 10.30 A.M. and sign the muster and then not to remain in the office and the watchman was called and ordered in his presence to bring the muster at the entrance and obtain his signature and not to allow him inside the office. The workman has brought on record these happenings in his letter dated 18-6-1981 which is placed by him on record. He stated in that letter :—

"this order amounts to suspension of me from duties without any reason whatsoever. It puts me under unbearable mental agony and sufferings."

The management sent a letter dated 20-6-1981 to the workman stating therin:—

"It is reported that effective from 16th May 1981, you have remained absent without permission and that you have made false allegations against the management of the firm in your letters dated 12th May, 15th May and 26th May, 81 as well as in your letters of 15th June and 18th June, 81. You are required to note that staying away from work without reason or sanction of leave is a serious misconduct and besides, you are making false allegations against the management as contained in your letters stated above are acts subversive of discipline.

You are hereby called upon to show cause in writing within 24 hours from receipt here of any disciplinary action should not be initiated against you for the alleged acts of misconduct."

In his letter dated 24-6-1981 the workman asserted all the facts that he had stated in his previous letters, and stated:—

"I now beg to submit that I have been totally honest in submitting absolute and unchallengeable truth before you and inspite of those unchallengeable facts if you desire to conduct any enquiry (impartially of course) I shall be the happiest employee to give absolute cooperation in the matter. However, I demand if the interest of honest, justice, and on the basis of basic human culture to withdraw the allegation which are absolutely false to your good selves knowledge. I request you to kindly call me back on duty without any further delay."

The workman sent a copy of this letter to the Regional Labour Commissioner (C). By a letter dated 27-6-1981 the workman requested the Regional Labour Commissioner (C) to intervene in this matter and to do justice to him. In his letter dated 4-7-81 the workman stated that he was extremely upset by the arrangement of the management from 2-7-1981 under which he was asked to work as a peon instead as a clerk. He concluded this letter by saying :—

"I submit that notwithstanding the illegality and immorality of the verbal orders passed to me through your other servants, I shall carry out the order after registering this protest and due to my poverty but shall claim my rights and privileges that of a clerk in your establishment."

10. The management in its letter to the workman dated 10-7-1981 stated that he should know he was not appointed as a clerk in their establishment, that at all times he had been employed for the purpose of doing the work of a peon and he was being paid wages that of a peon in conformity with the terms of settlement which they had with the Union. The management informed the workman by its said letter:—

"Either you carry out the duties of a peon or you do not do it and we may be constrained to discontinue you from our employment on the grounds that you are not interested in carrying out the functions of a peon for which you have been recruited in our establishment. You are hereby warned that you shall mind your language in your correspondence. At one breath when you say that you are a poor workman our language shows that you have an

uncontrollable tongue or expression which is manifest from your letter under reply."

The letter concluded by saying:—

"Within 24 hours of receipt hereof, you are required to intimate to us in writing whether you are ready and willing to discharge your functions as a peon or not without protest, failing which we shall be constrained to consider the advisability of retention of your services with us."

The management wrote another letter of the same dated to the workman saying, *inter alia*:—

"Either you attend to your duties regularly as a peon and carry out your functions as a peon or you quit employment if you consider below your dignity to work as a peon failing which we will be constrained to take steps which we may deem fit."

Again the management wrote a letter on 14-7-1981 asking the workman to state whether he was ready and willing to work as a peon voluntarily. The workman replied to that letter on the same day reiterating his contention that he had been appointed in the establishment as a general clerk on 1-8-1978 and that he had been doing the duties of a general clerk since then. The workman has stated in this letter:—

"I humbly request you not to compell a competent clerk like me to do peon's work but if you insist I have no other alternative."

There was further correspondence between the management and the workman reiterating the same contentions. On 31-7-1981 the management wrote to the workman saying:—

"You have been signing the salary register from Feb. 1980 and along with several other employees whose designations have been mentioned every month along with their names. You have been always shown as a peon and you have been functioning as a peon. Now all of a sudden, in the recent past, you have stated arising objection to do the work of a peon. By your letter dated 4th July, 1981, you have stated that you are not bound to obey as a peon and you would continue to carry on the work of a peon by registering your protest. By our letter dated 10th July, 1981 we have requested you to let us know whether you are ready and willing to discharge your functions as a peon or not without protest for which you have been giving vague replies and you further state that we should not enter into correspondence with you in the matter. Please note that we are not threatening you with any termination. The term of employment you have with us is for that of a peon and to function in that capacity voluntarily. You have been paid wages for nearly 12 years as a peon and you have been functioning as a peon and that now you express your disgust and protest to work as a peon. In these circumstances, it is difficult that we shall be in a position to continue you in our employment as you are not voluntarily accepting the services of a peon."

The management informed the workman by this letter that his services were discharged with immediate effect as there is no acceptable communication and rapport between the workmen and the management in respect of the nature of work the workman was required to carry out. So the services of the workman were terminated by the management by this letter.

11. Oral evidence adduced by the parties consisted of the deposition of the workman and the deposition of the Accountant, D. N. Chawala, on behalf of the management. Chawala stated in his deposition that there is a Union of workmen in their company viz., Transport and Dock Workers' Union and that the company paid salary to the workmen on the basis of the agreement entered into between the company and the said Union. The management has produced two registers of wages. Chawala stated that they maintain wage register for the workmen who are permanent. No wage register is maintained for temporary workmen. Payment is made to the temporary workmen on the basis of a voucher.

This workman was confirmed on 1-2-1980. His name, therefore, finds place in the wage registers. Wage register no. 1 for the month of February, 1980 contains an entry in respect of this workman at sr. no. 44, similarly, wage register no. 2 contains the entries for the months upto March, 1981. The entries in the registers are proved by the evidence of Chawala and the registers are marked as exhibits M-6 & 7. It will appear from these wage registers that the present workman was paid the wages of a peon and that he had signed those entries. The management has produced a copy of memorandum of settlement between the management and the Transport and Dock Workers' Union in application No. LCP-441 of 1981 and has requested that it be read in evidence in this reference. This settlement gives the scales of pay for peons, clerks and senior clerks. The scale of peon begins with Rs. 330. The scale of clerk begins with Rs. 425 and the scale of senior clerks begins with Rs. 460. The scale of pay of peon is Rs. 330-5-360-6-390-7-410. The dearness allowance paid to the workman was Rs. 99.40. The basic pay paid to the workman in the month of February, 1980 was Rs. 355. Chawala stated that the workman was being paid the pay of a peon. The workman does not dispute that he was not getting the pay of a clerk. The entries in the pay registers described him as a peon and he has signed those entries. The workman has admitted in his cross-examination that he has signed the pay registers for all the months in token of having received the salary. He does not say that word "peon" was put in the entry after he signed those entries. He admitted that he has nothing in writing to show that he was appointed as a clerk by the management. The management relies upon one more document viz., a letter dated 5-7-1980 addressed to the Senior Divisional Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Bomaby, in which the present workman is described as a peon. That letter is at exhibit M-1. From all these materials I have no hesitation in concluding that the workman was appointed as a peon and not as a clerk.

12. Strong reliance is placed on behalf of the workman upon the conduct of the management in not refuting his allegation in his letter dated 29-5-1979 that the workman was working as a general clerk for the last ten months. That allegation is for the first time denied in the letter of the management dated 10-7-1981. The management had the occasion to write a number of letters in the mean while to the workman. However, even though the workman had earlier stated in his letters that he was working as a clerk there was no denial by the management. From this circumstance it is sought to be argued for the workman that he was appointed as a clerk. No such inference can necessarily be drawn from the conduct of the management. The inference that can be drawn, in my opinion, is that the management must have taken the work of a clerk from this workman though he was appointed and was being paid as a peon. It may be pointed out that in his letter dated 25-4-1980 the workman has stated that he was doing work such as typing of certain documents along with outdoor work connected with the office of the company as well as its sister concerns. The management replied to this letter on 23-5-1980 stating, *inter alia*, that his work was not upto the mark and that they had no any sister concerns. It was not denied that the workman was doing the work of a clerk. In fact, the workman was asserting from 29-5-1979 that he had been working as a general clerk. However, as pointed out above there was no denial by the management till 10-7-1981. It, therefore, appears that the management was taking the work of a clerk from this workman. He was required to do the work of a clerk may be exclusively or substantially. However, he must not have been appointed as a clerk initially. The contents of the letter dated 29-5-1979 of the workman also lend a support to this inference. He states, in that letter that he had been working as a general clerk for the last ten months. He does not state there that he was appointed as a clerk. In that letter he stated that the salary which was being paid to him was quite inadequate to enable him to make ends meet. As his request was not considered by the management ultimately he filed an application under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act. on 8-4-1981 and in that application he has claimed the salary of a senior clerk at Rs. 460 basic per month. It appears that the trouble started from the time the management came to know about this application. Even though he was not appointed as a clerk, the circumstances show that he was asked to do the work of clerk.

13. The next and important question for consideration is whether the termination of the services of the workman with effect from 31st July, 1981, is by way of discharge simplicitor as contended by the management, or whether it is by way of punishment amounting to dismissal for misconduct. The question would also arise whether the termination of the services of the workman was bona fide. Mr. Varma, the learned counsel for the management, submitted that the establishment of M/s. Deluxe Shipping Agency is a commercial establishment which is governed by the provisions of the Bombay Shops and Establishments Act, 1948, and as per Section 38B of the said Act which was introduced in 1978, the provisions of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 in its application to the State of Maharashtra and the rules and standing orders (including model standing orders) made thereunder from time to time, shall mutatis mutandis apply to this establishment. He points out to the provisions in clause 23 of the Bombay Industrial Employment Model Standing Orders incorporated in Schedule I of the Standing Orders Act which provide that the employment of a permanent workman employed on a monthly rates of wages can be terminated by giving him one month's notice or on payment of one month's wages in lieu of notice. The management terminated the services of the workman by their letter dated 31st July, 1981, with immediate effect by paying one month's wages in lieu of notice. Mr. Varma submitted that the termination amount to discharge simplicitor and it does not amount to dismissal. As against his Mr. Bhaskaran, the learned counsel for the workman, contended that only a few weeks before the above letter of termination of the services of the workman the management on 28-6-1981 charged the workman with certain misconduct and called upon him to show-cause within 24 hours why disciplinary action should not be initiated against him for the alleged acts of misconduct. However, no disciplinary action was initiated and the management terminated the services of the workman which termination amounts to victimisation. According to Mr. Bhaskaran, even the reason given in the notice of termination viz., that the workman "expressed his disgust and protested to work as a peon" would amount to "wilful insubordination or disobedience of the reasonable orders of the superior" and that, therefore, the termination ought to have been preceeded by a departmental inquiry. According to Mr. Bhaskaran, the termination of the services of the workman in these circumstances amounts to dismissal for misconduct.

14. Mr. Varma relied upon the decision of the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court in the case of S. K. Kadany v. Dadajee Dhackjee & Co. Pvt. Ltd. (1977 L.I.C. 602). It is observed in this decision:—

"In cases of misconduct, it is open for the employer either to hold enquiry and dismiss the employee by way of punishment or discharge him and pay all retrenchment benefits. The employer has a choice to adopt either of the courses, provided action is bona fide. The question of mala fides or acting in colourable exercise of power, cannot arise unless allegations set up are unfounded, and imaginary, and the action is motivated by some ulterior purpose."

15. As against this, we have a decision of the Supreme Court in Gujarat Steel Tubes Ltd. v. Its Mazdoor Sabha (1980 L.I.C. 1004). The Majority decision of the Supreme Court laid down:—

"The form of the order of termination or the language in which it is couched is not conclusive. The court will lift the veil to see the true nature of the order. If two factor co-exist, an inference of punishment is reasonable though not inevitable. If the severance of service is effected, the first condition is fulfilled and if the foundation or cause causans of such severance is the servant's misconduct the second is fulfilled. If the basis or foundation for the order of termination is clearly not turpitudinous or stigmatic or rooted in misconduct or viscid with evil pecuniary effects, then the inference of dismissal stands negated and vice-versa. The Court will find out from other proceedings or documents connected with the formal order of termination what the true ground for the termination is. A termination effected because the master is satisfied of the misconduct and of the consequent desirability of termi-

nating the service of the delinquent servant is a dismissal, even if he had the right in law to terminate with an innocent order under the Standing Order or otherwise. Whether, in such a case the grounds are recorded in a different proceeding from the formal order does not detract from its nature. Nor the fact that, after being satisfied of the guilt, the master abandons the enquiry and proceeds to terminate. Given an alleged misconduct and a live nexus between it and the termination or service the conclusion is dismissal, even if full benefits as on simple termination, are given and non-injurious terminology is used."

According to the above observations we have to see what is the basis or foundation for the order of termination. The termination effected because the master is satisfied of the misconduct and of the consequent desirability of terminating the service of the delinquent servant is a dismissal even if he had the right in law to terminate with an innocent order under the standing order or otherwise. This could be so, even if full benefits as on simple termination, are given and non-injurious terminology is used. In addition to the charges levelled against the workman by the management in their letter dated 10th July, 1981, referred to above the letter of termination dated 31-7-1981 cannot be said to be a simple letter of termination. At any rate the termination cannot be said to be bona fide. I have found that the workman was not appointed as a clerk, but the work of a clerk was taken from him. The claim of the workman that he was appointed as a clerk is not substantiated. But, it appears from the circumstances emerging from the documentary evidence on record that the workman was made to work as a clerk. His demand for wages of a clerk on the basis that he was appointed as a clerk may not be justified. But his demand for wages on the basis that he was working as a clerk does not seem to be altogether unjustified. As I have pointed out there is no denial on the part of the management to the allegations in the workman's letter dated 25-4-1980 to the effect that he was doing the work of a clerk and for the time that denial appears in the letter of the management dated 10-7-1981. It is clear from the record that the workman did not refuse to work as a peon when he was asked to work as a peon. The workman in his letter dated 14th July, 1981, says:—

"I humbly request you not to compell a competent clerk like me to do peon's work but if you insist I have no other alternative."

He expressed the willingness to work as a peon but under protest. According to the management, this was not the proper conduct on the part of the workman. The foundation for the termination of the services of the workman would therefore be his misconduct. Such a termination in my opinion, would amount to dismissal or at any rate it will not be bona fide. I, therefore, find that the management of M/s. Deluxe Shipping Agency, Bombay, were not justified in terminating the services of the workman, K. R. Nair, with effect from 31st July, 1981.

16. The next question is to what relief he is entitled. Mr. Varma, the learned counsel for the management, submitted that the workman who showed his willingness to work as a peon only under protest should not be reinstated in case his termination was found to be invalid. As I said above, the workman did not refuse to work as a peon. Different considerations might have arisen if he had stated that he will not work as a peon. I, therefore, think that the workman is entitled to the relief of reinstatement.

17. The next question is about the back wages and whether full back wages should be paid to the workman. The normal rule on reinstatement is full back wages. However, as observed by the Supreme Court in the case of Gujarat Steel Tubes Ltd. (supra) the Industrial Court may well slice off a part if the workman is not wholly blameless. In this case the workman not only contended that he was doing the work of a clerk but that he was appointed as a clerk right from the beginning. Even though in this reference he claimed that he was appointed as a general clerk in his application under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, being application No. ICF-441 of 1981 he claimed the salary of a senior clerk. I, therefore, find that the conduct of the workman is not wholly blameless. The ends of justice, in my view, would meet if the workman is given only half the back wages.

18. In the result, I find that the termination of the services of the workman, K. R. Nair, with effect from 31st July, 1981, was not justified. He should be reinstated in service with half the back wages.

19. My award accordingly. No order as to costs.

M. D. KAMBLI, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-31012/15/81-D.IV(A)]

S.O. 2918.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay-400001, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Shri Datta B. Naik, owner of Launch 'ML Sudan' Goa and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/2 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Shri Datta B. Naik, Owner of Launch 'ML Sudan'

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri S. N. N. Karmali, Advocate.

For the workmen—1. Shri A. D'Costa, Advocate 2. Shri S. V. Rao, Goa Labour Union.

INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks

STATE : Goa, Daman and Diu

Mormugao, dated the 8th June, 1983

AWARD PART I

By their order No. L-36011(6)/82-D.IV(A) dated the 20th January, 1983 the Central Government referred the following dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

"Whether the action of Shri Datta B. Naik owner of Launch, 'NL Sudan' in terminating the services of S/shri Maruti Mangeshkar, Chandrakant Salekar and Roldao D'Souza Launch crew with effect from 6-4-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The dispute as it stands related to termination of services of S/shri Maruti Mangeshkar, Chandrakant Salekar and Roldao D'Souza Launch crew of Launch 'ML Sudan' by Shri Datta B. Naik, Launch Owner.

3. Today Shri S. V. Rao who represents the workmen and S. N. N. Karmali for the management inform that the dispute between the Launch Owner Sri D. B. Naik and the workman Roldao D'Souza has been amicably settled and he has collected his dues from the Launch Owner and therefore his dispute no longer survives. The reference in relation to Shri Roldao D'Souza is disposed of by Award Part I accordingly.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer
[No. L-36011(6)/82-D.IV(A)]

S.O. 2919.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Shri Narayan S. Parab, Owner of Launch 'ML Deepak' Goa and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY CAMP MORMUGAO

Reference No. CGIT-2/2 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Shri Narayan S. Parab, owner of Launch 'ML Deepak'

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Shri Manoker K. Naik, Partner.

For the workmen—1. Shri A. D'Costa, Advocate 2. Shri S. V. Rao, Goa Labour Union.

INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks

STATE : Goa, Daman and Diu

Mormugao, dated the 8th June, 1983

AWARD

By their order No. L-36011(7)/83-D.IV(A) dated 20-1-1983 the Central Government referred the following disputes for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act :—

"Whether the action of Shri Narayan S. Parab, Owner of Launch 'ML Deepak' in terminating the services of Shri Ramchandra Fadto, Launch Crew, with effect from 6-4-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. Today Shri S. V. Rao on behalf of the Goa Labour Union representing the workman informs that the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties whereby the workman has accepted in full and total satisfaction of his claim the dues offered to him by the employer and the dispute no longer survives. In view of this settlement and in view of the settlement though out of Court, the reference cannot survive and hence disposed of. Award accordingly.

No order as to costs.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer
[No. L-36011(7)/82-D.IV(A)]

S.O. 2920.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust Bombay, and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-25 of 1983

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Bombay Port Trust, Bombay.

AND

Their Workman

APPEARANCES:

For the employers—Mr. M. N. Bhatkal, Advocate
For the workman—Mr. M. B. Anchani, Advocate

INDUSTRY : Port & Docks STATE : Maharashtra
Bombay, the 20th day of May, 1983

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by order No. L-31012/7/81-D.IV(A) dated 16th November, 1981, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act,

1947 (14 of 1947), have referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the schedule mentioned below:—

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management in relation to the Bombay Port Trust in dismissing Shri Mashak Husseinsab, 'A' category mazdoor, Docks Department, from service with effect from the 29th December, 1980 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?”

2. The workman, Mashak Husseinsab, was first appointed as a Mazdoor in the Docks Department of the Bombay Port Trust on 14-11-1953. He was promoted as 'A' category Mazdoor on 29-4-1967. It is alleged by the employers that on 31-5-1974 at about 11.30 A.M., the workman along with another employee of the Bombay Port Trust, Yusuf Mustafa, was caught red-handed by the Bombay Port Trust watchman, Tukaram Pawar, for having in their possession respectively four pieces and seven pieces of ball bearings in rexin bags. The police were called. The workman and the other employee thereafter pointed out the place and the wooden case from which they had collected the ball bearings. The police arrested the workman and the other employee and after investigation submitted a chargesheet against them under Sections 381 and 114 of the Indian Penal Code. A criminal case was instituted against them in the Court of the Metropolitan Magistrate, Bellard Estate, Bombay. The workman was however, acquitted by giving him benefit of doubt by the Metropolitan Magistrate of the charges framed against him vide his judgment dated 18-8-1975. The workman was, thereafter, chargesheeted and a charge-sheet dated 9-3-1977 was served on him alleging that he had committed misconduct of attempt to commit theft of property lying under the care and custody of the Bombay Port Trust, under Rule 22(2)(b) of the Bombay Port Trust Rules and Regulations for non-scheduled staff. The workman by his reply dated 23-3-1977 denied the charge framed against him. A departmental inquiry was thereafter instituted to inquire into the charges against the workman and the other employee, Mustafa. Mr. H.P. Sarkar, Asstt. Legal Adviser was appointed as the inquiry officer.

3. In the inquiry the management examined six witnesses viz., K. R. Patil, Shcd. Superintendent, U. L. Sakpal, police constable on duty at the material time, V. D. Bhingardive, a panch working as watchman in Embarkation Commandant, A. D. Ghanekar, another panch working as watchman in the same establishment, Sayeed Ahmed Khan, Sub-Inspector of Police and R.J. Thorawat, Sub-Inspector of Police. The workman was defended by one C. S. Karalkar of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union who cross-examined the witnesses examined by the management. The workman examined one Fakir Mohammed, a causal labourer in Embarkation Commandant, as his witness.

4. The inquiry officer vide his report dated 13-3-1979 held that the charge against the workman was proved. The Docks Manager, who is the disciplinary authority accepted the findings of the inquiry officer and, having regard to the gravity and seriousness of the misconduct involved, imposed the penalty of dismissal on the workman. Accordingly, the workman was dismissed from the service of the Bombay Port Trust by an order dated 20-12-1980.

5. The employers by their written statement dated 25th May, 1982 submitted that the workman was dismissed after holding a proper and fair domestic inquiry and that the charge which was held proved against him being of a serious nature the punishment of dismissal meted out to the workman was proper.

6. The workman filed the statement of claim on 27-8-1982 pleading as follows. For the same alleged theft there was a criminal prosecution against him and his co-worker and both of them were acquitted by the learned Magistrate. The Bombay Port Trust having waited for the result of the criminal trial has no legal right to proceed against the workman departmentally after a lapse of three years. In the departmental inquiry the witnesses were tutored by the

prosecution to suit their convenience. The departmental inquiry was uncalled for and mala fide. The departmental inquiry was conducted in utter violation of the principles of natural justice. The discrepancies in the evidences of the witnesses were not given proper weight. The evidence was not properly appreciated by the inquiry officer. The findings of the inquiry officer are, therefore, perverse and order of dismissal based on such findings is illegal.

7. Preliminary issue was framed whether the inquiry held against the workman was fair, proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. By my order dated 17th March, 1983, I negatived the contentions raised in this behalf on behalf of the workmen. One of the contentions raised at that time was that the charge-sheet was submitted and the departmental inquiry was held against the workman after a long delay. The alleged incident was dated 31-5-1974 and the chargesheet was filed on 9-3-1977. This delay, it was submitted on behalf of the workman, was fatal and the departmental inquiry was not competent. I negatived that contention.

8. Mr. Anchan for the workman relied upon two decisions, one of Allahabad High Court in the case of Bhagawat Charan v. State of Uttar Pradesh ((1973 II L.L.J. 462) and another of Mysore High Court in the case of Govindaraj Shorty v. State of Mysore (1967 II L.L.J. 142). The Allahabad High Court observed in the aforesaid case that if a person is honourably acquitted by the criminal Court, then departmental proceedings on the basis of the same charges are not competent. To the same effect of the observation of the Mysore High Court in the aforesaid case. The judgment of the criminal Court is on record. It is at exhibit M-4. The learned Magistrate observed:—

“For all these reasons, I hold that prosecution evidence that accused nos. 1 and 2 were found in possession of the stolen property in the rexin bags and the stolen property was recovered at the instance of accused no. 1 from the receiver is not satisfactory, and reliable evidence in this case and no guilt is brought home to accused nos 1 and 2 for offence under Section 381 read with Sec. 114 of IPC charged against them and they deserve to be acquitted.”

It will appear from the above observations of the learned Magistrate that the accused were acquitted by giving them benefit of doubt. This is, therefore, not a case of clear acquittal. I, therefore, find that domestic inquiry cannot be said to be incompetent.

9. Now, the next question is whether there is reliable and satisfactory evidence to hold that this workman was found in possession of a rexin bag containing the alleged stolen articles. I think, there are a number of infirmities in the evidence adduced by the management. According to the management, watchman, Tukaram Pawar, found that this workman and another employee were carrying the rexin bag containing the bearings. Unfortunately, he was not available for giving evidence either in the criminal case or in the departmental inquiry as he is dead. However, his statement recorded before the police is to be found in the inquiry proceedings. It is relied upon by the parties. According to the Evidence Act, this statement may not be strictly admissible. However, the rules of the Evidence Act are not strictly applicable to the departmental inquiries and it will be proper not to ignore this statement. Watchman Pawar states in his statement:—

“On 31-3-1974, I reported for duty at 8.30 A.M. in shed No. 16, I.D. Then started checking of shed No. 16, I.D. I noticed one wooden case was found broken open in the middle portion of shed No. 16, I.D. Then Mr. Patil and I came and carpenter was called and it was repaired. Then I went for patrolling in the shed. After some time, I noticed two persons who were loitering suspiciously on the wharf of 16 I.D. at 11.00 hours I noticed two rexine bags having below the frame. At about 11.30 hrs. or so, I noticed the said two persons were carrying the said rexine bags and they were going towards 15 I.D. I asked them to stop but they started running. Hence, I chased them and

caught and took search of their bags. 1. Yusuf Mustafa, M. 52 years who was carrying a rexine green bag containing 7 bearings of Seem Coy.

steel & 2" in diameter & hollow 2. Mashak Hussien Sab M 41 yrs. was found carrying a rexine black bag containing 4 bearings of seem coy. 2" in diameter & hollow. Then I reported this matter to Mr. Patil and Mr. Patil called P.C. No. 741/1 who was on shed duty. Then their search was taken in presence of panchas. Then Mr. Patil informed police, police came and took charge of the accused along with the property under panchanama."

Now, it is the case of the management that the workman had taken out the bearings from the wooden case. Watchman Pawar noticed this broken wooden case and he reported that matter to Shri Patil, the Shed Superintendent. Then Patil and he came to the place where the wooden case was and the wooden case was repaired with the help of a carpenter. The management has brought evidence to show that subsequently after the workmen were arrested one of the workman (who is not the workman in this reference) offered to point out the wooden case and ultimately pointed out the same. However, according to the statement of watchman Pawar the wooden case was already seen and there was, therefore, no question of one of the suspects pointing it out. This raises a doubt that some pieces of evidence are fabricated. One more thing is required to be noticed. The Shed Superintendent, Patil was examined as PW-1 in the inquiry. The statement of Pawar to the effect that the wooden box was got repaired by Patil is flatly denied by Patil. He, however, says that the box which was pointed out by the accused was in repaired condition. It is pointed out for the workmen that Patil is telling a lie when he stated that he had not got the box repaired. Whatever that may be, the way in which Patil has given evidence shows that he is out to suppress certain facts. His evidence therefore cannot be safely relied upon.

10. I shall again refer to the statement of watchman Pawar before the Police. Pawar states that after the box was got repaired he went for patrolling in the shed. After some time he noticed two persons who were loitering suspiciously on the wharf of 16 I.D., at 11 A.M. Obviously, he refers to the present workman and the other employee accompanying him. Then he noticed two rexin bags below the frame. Watchman Pawar says further that at about 11.30 hrs., he noticed that these two persons were carrying the said rexin bags and they were going towards 15 I.D. He then asked them to stop, but they started running. Hence, he chased them and caught and took search of their bags. It will appear from this statement that Pawar noticed two rexin bags below the frame and at that time these two workmen were loitering suspiciously. Further story of watchman Pawar is that at about 11.30 A.M. these two workmen were carrying the said rexin bags and that he then chased them and caught them. This story appears to be a little bit unnatural. It is strenuously argued for the workman that it is improbable that watchman Pawar will chase these two persons and will catch them simultaneously with the bags in their hands. This act of alleged chasing and apprehending of the two workmen by Pawar took place in the broad day light and there would have been same witness to corroborate the story of Pawar. No such witness is produced. I will presently point out that the pancha witness does not support the case of the management that the two rexins bags were in the hands of this workman and the other employee. The picture, therefore, that emerges is that watchman Pawar saw the two rexins bags below the frame and at that time he saw the two persons loitering nearabout suspiciously. He had already seen the broken wooden case. Is is, therefore, not improbable that he must have suspected these two persons which included this workman and brought them to the Shed Superintendent, Mr. Patil.

11. The management has made a panchanama with the help of two panchas viz., Vithal Dhondi Bhingardire and Wahid Ali Ismille Khan. The panchanama produced on record states that the alleged stolen articles were recovered from the persons of the two employees. Pancha Vithal Dhondi Bhingardire is examined, as PW-3. He says in his evidence that

he saw tow bags lying on the table, of the Shed Superintendent Patil. He says that he did not see any search having been taken of the persons of the two employees. According to him, no search was made about the contents of the rexin bag lying on the table. The other pancha witness Wahid Ali Ismille Khan is not examined. The evidence brought by the management to the effect that the panchas were called and the rexin bags were recovered from the two workmen in presence is therefore highly suspicious. According to the statement of watchman Pawar the two workmen were apprehended at about 11.30 A.M. Assuming for the sake of argument that Pawar apprehended both of them while they were running with the two rexin bags in their hands, it is improbable that Pawar allow those bags to remain in the hands of the two workmen.

12. The management has again brought the evidence that one of the two workmen by name Yusuf Mustafa led the police and showed the wooden box to the police. That evidence is again suspicious. As is pointed out watchman Pawar says in his statement that before the two workmen were apprehended he saw a broken wooden case, that he reported that matter to Shed Superintendent, Mr. Patil, and that they then got the wooden case repaired. It is, thereafter that the two workmen were apprehended. The wooden case was therefore already seen by the Shed Superintendent. The evidence brought to the effect that one of the two workmen pointed out the wooden case appears to be unreliable.

13. We have the evidence of police constable, Uttam Laxman Sankpal. At the material time he was attached to the Yellow Gate Police Station. He says that at about 11.45 A.M. watchman Pawar came to the Shed Superintendent's table along with the two persons. At that time he was present near the table. The two persons were carrying, one bag each, in their hands and in those bags there were some articles. He says that at the instance of the Shed Superintendent he informed the Yellow Gate Police Station on phone. After the police officer came from the Yellow Gate Police Station the two persons pointed out the place and the wooden case wherefrom they had collected the material. The wooden case at that time was found in a broken condition. Police constable Sankpal proceeds to say that as per the instructions of the police officer he brought five panchas and the articles contained in the two bags were taken out. The statement of this police recorded in the investigation is in the inquiry papers. In that statement he says that at about 11.45 A.M. or so watchman Pawar came and informed him that he had detained two persons carrying some bearings in their hand bags. Then he along with the said watchman took search of their persons and found that they were carrying bearings on their person. He further says that he questioned them but they did not give any exact information about the articles found on their persons. In his deposition before the inquiry officer he does not say that he had taken the search of the bags which were said to be with the two persons. On the contrary he says that he phoned to Yellow Gate Police Station and that the police officers of that Police Station came there and then he called the panchas, and the bags in the hands of the workmen were then searched. However, in the statement before the police he had stated that immediately after Pawar told him that he had detained two persons he took search of their persons and found that they were carrying bearings on their person. There are discrepancies in his evidence and his evidence also cannot be safely replied upon.

14. On carefully scrutinising the evidence, it appears that the story that watchman Pawar chased and apprehended the two workmen while they were running and while they were carrying the rexin bags in their hands does not inspire confidence. According to the statement of Pawar before the police these two persons were moving in a suspicious manner, when he saw that the rexin bags were lying under the frame. Pawar must have apprehended them on suspicion. The story that Pawar saw the rexin bags in the hands of the two workmen is highly unreliable. There is no independent reliable evidence to show that the rexin bags were on the person of the two persons when they were brought at the office of the Shed Superintendent. One of the panchas examined did not support the management's case in that behalf and the other pancha is not examined. There are discrepancies in the evidence and it appears that there is attempt to fabricate some pieces of evidence. It is, therefore, not proved that this workman along with the other employee was caught while he was carrying the rexin bags containing the alleged stolen

article, I am, therefore, of the opinion that the charge against him is not proved. The action of the management, therefore, in dismissing this workman is not justified. The workman, therefore, will be entitled to the relief of reinstatement.

15. The next question is about the back wages. The workman has examined himself in this reference to show that he was not gainfully employed after his dismissal. The question, therefore, is whether he should be paid full back wages. I am not inclined to grant full back wages. The wooden box containing the bearings is found broken at or about the same time the workman and the other employees were found moving near about in suspicious condition. The workman has not alleged that the relations between him and watchman Pawar were not good. Pawar might have given exaggerated account when he stated that he caught this workman along with another employee while they were carrying the bags in their hands. However, the suspicion does arise that this workman must have been concerned in the act of breaking upon the wooden case and taking out some contents therefrom. I am, therefore, not inclined to grant full back wages to the workman. The ends of justice, in my opinion, would meet if he is granted only one-fourth of the back wages.

16. In short, I find that there was no sufficient evidence to prove the charge framed against the workman. The order of dismissal passed against him was, therefore, not justified. The workman will, therefore, be entitled to reinstatement, but with one-fourth of the back wages only.

17. My award accordingly. No order as to costs.

M. D. KAMBLI, Presiding Officer,
[No. L-31012(7)/81-D. IV(A)]

S.O. 2921.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. II Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Shri Joao L. D. Souza, Goa and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY CAMP, MORMUGAO

Reference No. CGIT-2/6 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Shri Joao L. D. Souza,

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the employer—Shri S. N. N. Karmali, Advocate.

For the workmen—1. Shri A. D'Costa, Advocate, 2.

Shri S. V. Rao C/o Goa Labor Union.

INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks

STATE : Goa, Daman and Diu

Mormugao, the 8th June, 1983

AWARD

By their order No. L-36011(8)/82-D.IV(A) dated January, 1983 the following dispute has been referred for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

“Whether the action of Shri Joao L. D'Souza, owner of Launch 'ML' Sacoince in terminating the services of S/shri Francis D'Souza and Narayan Gaonkar, with effect from 6-4-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?”

2. Despite several notices to the parties neither the Union nor the management filed their respective claims statement and

written statement and the reasons behind the same as stated by Shri S.V. Rao, who is appearing on behalf of the workmen is that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties whereby the workmen Sarvashri Francis D'Souza and Narayan Gaonkar have accepted all the dues in full and total satisfaction of their claim and nothing remains payable. Shri Rao informs accordingly and Shri S. N. N. Karmali endorses his statement. Since the matter is amicably settled though out of court the reference cannot survive and hence disposed of. Award accordingly.

No order as to costs.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

[No. L-36011(8)/82-D.IV(A)]

R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 1st July, 1983

S.O. 2922.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. II Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Shri Francisco Almeida Launch owner, Goa and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY CAMP, MORMUGAO

Reference No. CGIT-2/1 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to Shri Francisco Almeida, Launch Owner

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—No appearance.

For the workman—Shri Xavier V. J. Carvalho, (workman in person)

INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks

STATE : Goa, Daman and Diu

Mormugao, the 8th June, 1983

AWARD

(Dictated in the open court)

By their order No. L-36012 (6)/82-D.IV (A) dated 20th January 1983 the Central Government referred the following dispute for adjudication under Section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act :—

“Whether the action of Shri Francisco Almeida, Launch Owner, Vasco-da-Gama in terminating the services of Shri Xavier V. J. Carvalho, Clerk w.e.f. 15-12-1978 is justified? If not to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

2. On receipt of the reference notices were issued to the parties out of whom it is only the workman who has filed the statement of claim whereby he contends that although he was continuously in the service of the employer namely Shri Francisco Almeida as General Clerk from 23-12-1969 all of a sudden on 14-12-1978 his services were terminated by notice copy of which is annexed as Exhibit A. The contention of the workman is that neither he was paid retrenchment compensation nor any notice pay as such invalidating the notice under Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act and therefore the reliefs.

3. As already stated the management despite repeated notices failed to file written statement and thus failed to counter all the allegations.

4. In respect of his contention the workman has examined himself whereby he is revoicing all his averments. If he was in the service of the employer continuously from 1969, in the year 1978 i.e. at the time of alleged retrenchment if the employer wanted to sever the relationship by issuing retrenchment notice, it was incumbent on the employer under Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act to give one month's notice in writing and to pay compensation equivalent to fifteen days' average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months. These were statutory obligations on the employer and even if the failure to comply the provisions of Section 25F(c) 13 ignored in the absence of compliance of Section 25(a) and (b) the retrenchment becomes invalidated and illegal, and therefore unenforceable. In the notice itself there is a promise to pay the dues but no offer to pay. Similarly, there is the admission of failure to pay two months pay before the date and further it is stated that notice would be issued subsequently terminating the service. All these averments in the notice described as notice of retrenchment bear out the contentions of the workman regarding the failure to comply with the provisions of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act and consequently the termination of service can never be said to be justified since it has violated the legal and mandatory provisions.

5. The workman says that from the time of alleged retrenchment he is unemployed. He further says because of want of service certificate issued by the employer though there was attempt on his part to secure service he failed to get it. Therefore since the workman is not gainfully employed till now the only effect would be that the workman would be continued to be in the employment till this date. The workman does not claim any reinstatement therefore the severance of the relationship would be deemed to have taken place not on 1-12-1978 but on today meaning thereby that the workman shall be entitled to get arrears of wages at the rate of Rs. 100/- per month till this date besides notice pay as well as retrenchment compensation as laid down under Section 25F(a) and (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

Award accordingly.

No order as to costs.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer
[No. L-36012(6)/82-D.IV(A)]

S.O. 2923.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay-400001, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Shri Xavier Rodrigues owner of Launch 'ML Lucia' Goa, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, BOMBAY : MORMUGAO

Reference No. CGIT-2/11 of 1983

PARTIES :

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO SHRI XAVIER ROTRIGUES

Owner of Launch 'ML Lucia'

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—No appearance

For the workmen—1. Shri A. D'Costa Advocate. 2. Shri S. V. Rao, Goa Labour Union

STATE : Goa, Daman and Diu

INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks

Mormugao, the 8th June, 1983

AWARD

By their order No. L-36011/13/82/DIV(A) dated 2nd February, 1983 the Central Government referred the following dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

"Whether the action of Shri Xavier Rodrigues, Owner of Launch 'ML Lucia' in stopping Shri Govind Khorjevenkar, Launch crew from work with effect from 6-4-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?"

2. Despite notices to the parties neither the Union nor the management filed statement of claim or written statement, and the reason behind the same as stated by Shri S. V. Rao, who is appearing on behalf of the workmen is that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties whereby the workmen Shri Govind Khorjevenkar has accepted all the dues in full and total satisfaction of his claim and nothing remains payable. Shri Rao informs accordingly and therefore since the matter is amicably settled though out of court the reference cannot survive and hence disposed of. Award accordingly. No order as to costs.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-36011(13)/82-D.IV(A)]

S.O. 2924.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay-400001, in the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to Shri Conceicao Pereira, Owner of Launch 'ML Joseph Anselmo' and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/13 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in Relation to Shri Conceicao Pereira, Owner of Launch 'ML JOSEPH ANSELMO'

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employer.—Shri S. N. N. Karmali, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—1. Shri A. D'Costa, Advocate.

2. Shri S. V. Rao, Goa Labour Union.

STATE : Goa, Daman and Diu INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks.

Mormugao, dated the 8th June, 1983

AWARD PART-I

(Dictated in the Open Court)

By their order No. L-36011/16/82/DIV(A) dated 28-2-83 the Central Government referred the following dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

"Whether the action of Shri Conceicao Pereira, Owner of Launch 'ML JOSEPH ANSELMO' in stopping S/Shri Jose Vaz, Antony Fernandes and Jose Fernandes, Launch crew from work with effect from 6-4-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled?"

2. The dispute as it stands is between the employer Shri Conceicao Pereira, Owner of Launch 'ML JOSEPH

ANSELMO' and three workmen namely S/Shri Jose Vaz, Antony Fernandes and Jose Fernandes. It related to prevention of allowing the workmen to work from 6-4-82 by the Launch Owner.

3. Today Shri S. V. Rao, on behalf of Goa Labour Union who represents the workmen and Shri S. N. N. Karmali for the management are present and they inform that the dispute between the Launch Owner on one hand and the workman S/Shri Jose Vaz and Antony Fernandes has been amicably settled and these two workmen collected their dues from the Launch Owner and therefore their dispute no longer survives. The reference in relation to these two workmen is disposed of by Award Part I accordingly.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-36011(16)/82-D.IV(A)]

S.O. 2925.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Shri F.X.D. Souza Owner of Launch 'ML Anita' Goa, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, BOMBAY

CAMP : MORMUGAO

PRESENT :

Shri M. A. Deshpande, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/14 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to Shri F. X. D'Souza, Owner of Launch 'ML Anita'.

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the employer—No appearance

For the workmen—1. Shri A. D'Costa, Advocate.

2. Shri S. V. Rao, Goa Labour Union.

STATE : Goa, Daman and Diu INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks.

Mormugao, the 8th June, 1983

AWARD

(Dictated in the Open Court)

By their order No. L-36/11/18/82/D.IV(A) dated the 28th February, 1980 the Central Government referred the following dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

"Whether the action of Shri F. X. D'Souza, Owner of Launch 'ML Anita' in stopping S/Shri Ashok Parandkar and Ram Parab from work with effect from 6-4-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief the said workmen are entitled ?".

2. Despite notices, to the parties neither the Union or the management filed statement of claim or written statement, and the reason behind the same as stated by Shri S.V. Rao who is representing the workmen is that the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties whereby the workman Shri Ashok Parandkar and Shri Ram Parab have accepted all the dues in full and total satisfaction of their claim and nothing remains payable. In view of the above admission on behalf of the workmen, since the matter

409 GI/83—5

is amicably settled though out of court the reference cannot survive and hence disposed of Award accordingly. No order as to costs.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-36011(18)/82-D.IV(A)]

R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer.

New Delhi, the 27th June, 1983

S.O. 2926.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Union Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23-6-83.

BEFORE JUSTICE SHRI K. K. DUBE, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(36)1978

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of the Union Bank of India, Bhopal and their workman, Phool Singh, Peon of Bhopal Branch of the Bank, represented through the M.P. Bank Employees Association C/o. United Commercial Bank, Marwari Road, Bhopal (M.P.)

APPEARANCES :

For workman—Shri R. C. Bajpai, Advocate.

For Management—S/Shri Gulab Gupta and S. K. Rao, Advocates.

INDUSTRY : Bank DISTRICT : Bhopal (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated : June 16, 1983

The Central Government in exercise of its powers under Sec. 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the dispute regarding the dismissal of Phool Singh for adjudication under Notification No. L-12012/1/78-D.II.A. dated 26/27-7-1978. The dispute is in following terms :—

"Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India, Bhopal in dismissing Shri Phool Singh, Peon of Bhopal Branch of the Bank vide Enquiry Officers letter No. RO:MP:STF: 1901 dated 31-5-76 and subsequently confirmed by Astd. General Manager vide his letter dated 12-6-76 is justified? If not, to

what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. Phool Singh was dismissed after a departmental enquiry. The charge-sheet reads as under :—

On 18-11-72 Mr. Phool Singh in connivance with Mr. Jabir Ali obtained against token No. 21 payment of a forged cheque No. 36439 for Rs. 800 drawn on S.B. Account No. 1531 of Mr. G. I. Tanwani along with payments against token Nos. 19 and 20 which were withdrawal forms for Rs. 60 and Rs. 100 drawn on account of Shri Jabir Ali and Mrs. Naseem Begum and signed on reverse by Jabir Ali. This forged cheque of Rs. 800 was subsequently removed from the records of the Bank.

The aforesaid conduct constituted the following gross misconduct :—

- (i) misappropriation of funds.
- (ii) doing acts prejudicial to the interest of the Bank.

A departmental enquiry against Phool Singh was conducted by Shri Ram Sharma. Shri Ram Sharma found that Phool Singh in connivance with Jabir Ali had withdrawn Rs. 800 against a forged cheque with the sole intention of defrauding the Bank and misappropriating the account. After a show cause notice asking him to show cause why he should not be dismissed, Phool Singh was dismissed. The Asstt. General Manager, Department of Personnel (I.R. Cell) was also of the opinion on the basis of the enquiry papers that the dismissal was justified. Phool Singh thereafter filed an appeal. In the meantime the Central Government has referred the dispute for adjudication.

3. My predecessor came to the conclusion that the departmental enquiry conducted by Shri Sharma against Phool Singh was vitiated as it violated principle of natural justice and was not conducted fairly. This order dated 22-1-1981 was challenged before the High Court in a writ petition. The Division Bench of M.P. High Court at Jabalpur came to the conclusion that the order of the Tribunal holding that the domestic enquiry was bad was proper and thus dismissed the management's writ petition. Therefore as far as the departmental enquiry is concerned the same is quashed. The Tribunal, however, permitted the Bank to lead evidence to establish the misconduct against Phool Singh. Parties have led evidence and I have now to determine whether any misconduct as alleged is proved against Phool Singh and whether the misconduct would justify the punishment of dismissal of Phool Singh.

4. The management led evidence of a number of witness to prove the procedure as to how a cheque would be passed when presented to a Bank. The procedure followed is generally that when a cheque was presented for payment it was received by the clerk in charge of the scroll register. After receiving the cheque he hands over the token to the person presenting the cheque. The cheque then goes to the ledger clerk, who verifies account in the light of the cheque drawn, also verified that the cheque is from the cheque book which was issued to the account holder; then he puts the folio number with his initials and sends it to the passing officer. The passing officer then verifies the cheque and forwards it to the Cash Branch with his endorsement for the cheque being passed for payment.

5. It has been fully made out on the evidence of Amrit Lal Kalra, Branch Manager (M.W. 2), K. A. Thakkar (MW 4), Ashok Kumar Shathe (M.W. 5), Surendra Kumar Atri (M.W. 6), B. L. Jaiswal (M.W. 7), Mohd. Abdul Wali (M.W. 8) and U.P. Vaidya (M.W. 1) that a blank Saving Bank cheque Book was stolen. The blank cheque books are kept in the custody of the Accountant but the peons have an access to it and it was possible that a peon could have stolen the cheque book. This is clear from Kalra's evidence. It is easy to see that usually nobody would suspect the Bank's peons who are asked to do various duties of bringing out documents from the almirah and such place of safety.

6. It is proved from the evidence that Tanwani had not drawn the cheque of Rs. 800 and a cheque had been forged in his name and money obtained from the Bank. The cheque forged was not from the cheque book issued to Tanwani but from a cheque stolen from the Bank. On the same day i.e. 18-11-1972 when forged cheque was presented the two withdrawals from the Bank, one of Rs. 60 drawn on the S. B. Account of Jabir Ali and another of Rs. 100 drawn on account of wife of Jabir Ali Mrs. Naseem Begum had been presented for encashment at the counter. In respect of withdrawals of Rs. 60 and Rs. 100 token nos. 19 and 20 were issued while with respect to the forged cheque token no. 21 was issued. It can be presumed that as far as the withdrawals of Rs. 60 and Rs. 100 were concerned the withdrawal-slip and cheque were presented by Jabir Ali and he had obtained token nos. 19 and 20. It is, however, now proved as to who presented the forged cheque and obtained token no. 21. The three cheques have been noted in the respective scroll books. As already stated, it is also firmly established that the forged cheque was from a cheque book stolen from the Bank.

7. The evidence of Vaidya would establish that token nos. 19, 20 and 21 were brought by

Phool Singh to him for payment. The payments of all these withdrawals were made to Phool Singh.

8. The forged cheque of Rs. 800 was found missing when the account was tried to be tallied. A voucher in substitution of the same had to be made to record the transaction.

9. Now a false document was made and a stolen cheque was used to forge a cheque of Rs. 800. This cheque was presented at the Bank and token no. 21 was given to the person presenting it. Token no. 21 was delivered by Phool Singh to Vaidya, the Cashier and Vaidya had paid Rs. 800 for this forged cheque. It is clear that in the entire fraud many persons may have had a hand, but it appears clear to us that the person who presented the forged cheque and who obtained payment for the same have certainly played important parts in defrauding the Bank. The complicity of the person who obtained payment of the cheque of Rs. 800 in the fraud cannot be gainsaid. Phool Singh has given no explanation as to how he came in possession of token no. 21 issued for the forged cheque. He has given no explanation what he had done about Rs. 800. His case is of mere denial. Phool Singh's participation is established on the evidence of Vaidya (M.W. 1) that he had received the token no. 21 for cheque of Rs. 800 which was forged which he had produced before Vaidya. Phool Singh received payment from cashier for this forged cheque. Vaidya's evidence has been criticised on the ground that he had been making different statements at different times. Before the Tribunal he had explained the circumstances under which he had given the affidavit (Ex. M|31) and written the letter Ex. M|32. What is of importance in this case is that Vaidya had been under pressure of the employees not to depose against Jabir Ali and Phool Singh. Ex. M|30 would show that he had at an early stage stated that his name should not be given out as an informant because he feared that the two peons or the union people would harm him. This was made as early as 1973. His evidence is corroborated by Mohd. Abdul Wali. I am inclined to believe the evidence of Vaidya to hold that Phool Singh had received payment for a forged cheque of Rs. 800 on token no. 21. Phool Singh has not given any explanation as to how he came in possession of the stolen cheque. It is quite probable that Vaidya would remember that Phool Singh had obtained the payment of Rs. 800 on token no. 21. After all on the same date it was known that the cheque was missing and at least on the following date it was clear that a fraud had been practised. The Cashier was bound to remember as to who had taken payment of Rs. 800 particularly when he remembers this important fact that payment for token nos. 19, 20 and 21 were made together and that token nos. 19 and 20 were with respect to withdrawals of Jabir Ali who was another peon of the Bank and whom he well knew.

It was understandable that another peon or the Bank had collected money on behalf of his fellow employee in the Bank. These facts are bound to be remembered by Vaidya and rely on his evidence. The affidavit Ex. M|31 is sufficiently explained.

10. Once the fact is established that he had received payment for the forged cheque the burden squarely falls on him to explain in how he came in possession token no. 21 of the cheque. He has denied forging of cheque but not given any satisfactory explanation as to how he came in possession of it. In fact, he is falsely denying having obtained the payment of Rs. 800. In absence of a reasonable explanation, from the possession of token no. 21 a presumption can legitimately be drawn that he is himself the perpetrator of the fraud or was in league with the culprits.

11. Phool Singh has been charge-sheeted that, he, in connivance with Jabir Ali obtained payment of token no. 21 i.e. payment of a forged cheque No. 36439 drawn on the Savings Bank Account No. 1531 of Mr. G. I. Tanwani. There is no good evidence that Jabir Ali gave him token no. 21. But this should not materially effect the case against him.

12. As earlier pointed out that once it is established that Phool Singh had obtained payment on token no. 21 which had been issued for the forged cheque his complicity in the fraud was established. His denial that he had not taken payment of Rs. 800 further reinforces the conclusion that such denial is because he knew about fraudulent nature of the transaction. The guilty mind can clearly be seen in such a denial. Therefore despite the fact that Jabir Ali has been exonerated he has to be held guilty of misconduct. His conduct undoubtedly was prejudicial to the interest of the Bank and is a serious misconduct for which he was rightly dismissed. Even if Jabir Ali's participation is not proved this would not materially effect his conduct. His conduct is clearly separable from that of Jabir Ali and it would not be said that he was prejudice in defending his case when Jabir Ali's participation is taken out of the charge. I see no prejudice to him. The crux of the thing is that he had obtained payment of Rs. 800 on token no. 21 and has falsely denied this. If he were innocent he could have given the explanation as to how he came in possession of token no. 21. On the evidence therefore the department has succeeded in establishing misconduct against Phool Singh.

13. The conduct to say the least is most dishonest and detrimental to the interest of the Bank. The punishment of dismissal is wholly merited in his case. I would, therefore, made the award approving the action of the management of the Union Bank of India, Bhopal and hold that they were fully justified in dismissing Phool Singh, Peon,

Bhopal Branch of the Bank. The domestic enquiry held by Shri Sharma and the finding dated 31st May, 1976 given by him which was confirmed by the Assistant General Manager by his letter dated 12th June, 1976 is held not properly done and is quashed. But the misconduct against Phool Singh is fully made out for which he has been rightly dismissed. The workman is not entitled to any relief. There shall be no order as to costs in the peculiar circumstances of the case.

K. K. DUBE, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012/4/78-D. II(A)]

S.O. 2927.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 21-6-1983.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL : CALCUTTA

Reference No. 6 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bank of India

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers—Mr. K. K. Sarkar, Industrial Relations Officer.

On behalf of Mr. A. D. Singh, Workmen—An Officer of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal INDUSTRY : Banking

AWARD.

The undermentioned dispute was sent to this Tribunal by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour by their Order No. L-12012(236)/81, II(A) dated 19 February, 1982 for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Bank of India in relation to their Chittaranjan Avenue Branch, Calcutta, in reverting Shri Prasanta Kumar Ghosh, staff Clerk to the post of subordinate staff in pursuance of memo No. RO : PERS : KKS : 12299 dated the

25-7-77 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the concerned workmen entitled ?"

2. Mr. P. K. Ghosh, a sub-staff of the Bank of India did not undertake the journey by train on 16 August 1974 along with members of his family ex-Howrah to Delhi for which he obtained reimbursement of Rs. 294.90 P towards his leave fair concession facility from the bank. He cancelled his tickets and obtained refund from railway authorities without informing the bank and unauthorisedly retained it. According to the bank, his act amounted to misuse of leave fare concession facility which was a gross misconduct in terms of clause 19.5 (j) of the first bipartite settlement of 1966. The management issued a show cause notice dated 12 August 1976 (Ext. W4=M6) asking him to show cause within a week of the receipt of it as to why disciplinary action should not be taken against him. He gave written explanation (Ext. W5) on 24 August, 1976. He denied the charge. It was found to be unsatisfactory. The management without issuing any chargesheet and without holding enquiry issued a letter Ext. W6=M5 dated 10 June 1977 to P.K. Ghosh stating the alleged facts and saying, "In view of the above, it is proposed to award you punishment of stoppage of one increment permanently, and to recoup the amount of Rs. 294.90 P reimbursed to you as aforesaid. However, this is without any prejudice to our rights to initiate any disciplinary action against you. You are hereby called upon to submit your explanation within a week of this memorandum, as to why the proposed punishment would not be awarded to you and the amount which is retained by you unauthorisedly should not be refunded to the bank forth-with". A reply (Ext. W7) dated 21 June, 1977 was sent by P. K. Ghosh that this act of the management was in utter denial of natural justice. The management did not express any opinion whether the act of P.K. Ghosh was an offence or not. The procedure of disciplinary action has been prescribed by clause 19.1 to 19.16 in Chapter XIX of the Bipartite Settlement of 19 October, 1966. If it is an offence, the procedure is different. The delinquent has to be prosecuted. If he is not put to trial within a year of the commission of the offence the management may under clause 19.4 treat the act as an act of 'gross misconduct' or minor misconduct as the case may be. The management, thus does not appear to have followed the proper procedure. Any way P. K. Ghosh admitted by his letter dated 4 August, 1977 (Ext. W9=M3) that he could not avail the journey as per tickets which were shown to the bank. He also admitted the punishment of stoppage of one increment permanently for misuse of leave fare concession as proposed by the bank in their letter dated 10 June, 1977 and he also refunded the amount of Rs. 294.90 P to the bank. This

punishment was imposed by the final order of the bank dated 30 April 1979 (Ext. W 10). This is not the subject-matter of reference. I, therefore, do not say anything about this punishment and the matter in this respect ends here.

3. But the management did not sit silent after issue of the proposed punishment of 10 June, 1977. In the very next month on 25th July, 1977 they reverted P.K. Ghosh to the original post (i.e. subordinate cadre). P.K. Ghosh had been promoted to the clerical cadre on 1 June, 1977 after competing in oral and written test. He was assigned the duties of cash-cum-accountant clerk with effect from 1st June, 1977. All of a sudden he received a letter dated 25th July, 1977 (Ext. W8=M4) that he was reverted to the original assignment (i.e. subordinate cadre) and that he was to report to the staff department, Calcutta main office for duty. The only ground given in that letter (Ext W8=M4) in para 3 is that according to the Bank's rules. "Where any disciplinary action has been initiated for any gross misconduct against a member of a subordinate staff who is selected for promotion, the management shall hold the promotion in abeyance till the enquiry is over." Mr. K. K. Sarkar, Industrial Relations Officer, appearing for the management has drawn my attention to the second part of rule 3 of the Bank Rules, 1977 and its explanations which is as below:

"Further where disciplinary action has already been initiated for any gross misconduct against a member of subordinate staff who is selected for promotion, the Management shall hold his promotion in abeyance till the disciplinary proceedings are over. If ultimately he is found to be not guilty, the Management shall promote the said employee from the date the decision is given after completion of the disciplinary proceedings. In case of punishment being award, he shall not be promoted and shall further be debarred from applying for promotion for a period of 3 years from the date of punishment

Explanation :

A disciplinary action shall be deemed to have been initiated when an employee is served with a chargesheet or with a notice or memo stating the alleged misconduct and asking him to show cause why disciplinary action should not be taken against him or why appropriate punishment should not be awarded to him."

He submits that the disciplinary action in the present case shall be deemed to have been initiated when P. K. Ghosh was served with the notice dated 12 August 1976 (Ext W4=M6) and that

it was pending on 1 June 1977 when he was promoted. His argument is that the management acted inadvertently and it was by sheer mistake that P. K. Ghosh was promoted, that his promotion should have been kept in abeyance. He also submits that the reversion was not a punishment because it was not a legal and proper promotion, that it was a mistaken promotion, and that P.K. Ghosh was not deprived of any right or benefit because he was not entitled to it. Mr. A.D. Singh an Office bearer of the Union argued that the said provision of the bank's rule would apply only to that subordinate staff who is selected for promotion and not to a promoted staff. He further argued that there is nothing in the bank's rules to indicate that if the management promotes an employee in violation of its own rule, their act will be null and void and therefore the promotion of Sri Ghosh can not be held to be invalid.

4. I am of the opinion that the order of reversion has to be set aside on the short ground that natural justice was breached. The order of reversion entitled civil consequences. It *prima facie* inflicted a penalty upon him as it was demotion from a higher post to a lower post. It is well settled that administrative powers must be exercised fairly. Clearly natural justice was demanded in this case. In my opinion a breach of natural justice nullified the reversion. If notice of the reversion would have been given to the employee, the latter would have opportunity to show as to whether or not rule 3 was applicable to a promoted employee, whether his promotion was valid, whether or not the reversion amounted to punishment, whether there could be 'reversion' when he was being given punishment of stoppage of one increment permanently on the same set of facts and whether any disciplinary proceeding was pending when he was promoted on 1 June, 1977. In my opinion he was deprived of this opportunity and there was thus violation of the principles of natural justice. Sri K.K. Sarkar strongly relied on *Sinha (GK) v Collector of Central Excise, Allahabad, 1957 (J) 11J 263*. In that case some inspectors (or ordinary grade) had been promoted to the post of inspectors (selection grade) by the Collector without keeping in view the promotion rule of "seniority-cum-fitness". Government asked the Collector to review his order and to follow the rule. The Collector gave notice to the promoted inspectors as to why the order of promotion be not reviewed and their appointments cancelled. The concerned officer and some others had submitted explanations. After considering the explanations the Collector cancelled the appointment. It is clear that in that case the officer concerned was not accused of any fault and there was no intention or any motive of the Collector to punish the employee for some misconduct. Notice had also been given to the employees as to why their appointment be not cancelled. They wanted a second notice under

Article 311(2) of the Constitution of India. It was held that Article 311(2) had no application because demotion was not due to any fault of the officer. It is to be seen that demotion in that case was not without notice. Hence that case is of no assistance to the management. I accordingly hold that Ext W8 the order of reversion being in violation of natural justice is null and void and it is no order in the eye of law. It followed that the portion of the order dated 30 April 1979, Para 4 (Ext W 11 = M1) by which the reversion was kept operative is of no value because a nullity cannot be made alive. P. K. Ghosh protested by his letter dated 9 July 1979 (Ext W11) but in vain : vide Ext W12 dated 6 November 1979. The result is that P. K. Ghosh must be held to be continuing in clerical cadre and he must be paid the excess wages, the same being the difference in wages as claimed, that is, the difference in the pay of a clerk and that of a subordinate staff from the date of reversion (25 July 1977) till date.

5. For the foregoing reasons my concluded award is that the action of the management of Bank of India in relation to their Chittaranjan Avenue Branch, Calcutta in reverting Sri Prasanto Kumar Ghosh, staff Clerk to the post of Subordinate staff in pursuance of memo No. PERS : KKS: 12299 dated the 25th July 1977 is not justified. It follows that the workman Shri P. K. Ghosh is entitled to be reinstated to his post in clerical cadre as having continued in the cadre and is also entitled to receive the monetary benefit, viz. the difference in wages payable to a clerk and that payable to subordinate staff from the date of reversion (25 July 1977) till date.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 13th June 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-12012/236/81. D. II(A)]

S.O. 2928.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23-6-1983.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL : CALCUTTA**

REFERENCE NO. 21 OF 1979

PARTIES :

The management of State Bank of India,
Calcutta

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh—Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Management :

Mr. P. K. Mukherjee, Advocate, with
Mr. S. K. Dutta, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen :

Mr. A. K. Mitra, Counsel, with
Mr. S. K. Mazumdar Advocate.

STATE : West Bengal INDUSTRY : Banking

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by their Order No. L-12012/32/78-D. II. A dated 4th April, 1979, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of the State Bank of India, Local Head Office, Jeevan Deep, 1-Middleton Street, Calcutta in dismissing Shri Tarun Kumar Banerjee, Cashier from the service of the Bank with effect from 31-3-77 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?”

2. Tarun Kumar Banerjee was dismissed with effect from 31 March, 1977 on the basis of the enquiry report of Sri D.P. Bhattacharya, MW-1 dated 27 February 1974. The enquiry was held by him on 6 February 1974. The Enquiry Officer found Tarun Kumar Banerjee guilty of the charge of misconduct. The chargesheet (Ext. M-4) dated 10 October 1973 is as under :

“You are hereby required to show cause why disciplinary action should not be taken against you on the following charges :

That at about 11 A.M. in the 23rd June, 1973 one Sm. Parul Rani Chowdhury, a constituent of the Bank, handed over to you over the Branch cash counter a sum of Rs. 3,002.40 along with two draft applications each for Rs. 1,001.20. Thus, although on your own admission, you received an excess amount of Rs. 1,000 (Rs. 3,002.40 less Rs. 2,002.40 from Sm. Chowdhury. You did neither refund the excess amount to the depositor nor make any enquiry about the disposal of the excess amounts and/or arrange for the excess amount to be deposited to the Branch Sundry Deposits Account in contravention of the Bank's instructions. Instead, on your own admission, you retained the excess amount in your own person with the intention of misappropriating the same. Subsequently, at about 1.30 P.M. on the same day, when the said Sm. Chowdhury came to the Branch and

demanded the amount handed over to you in excess, viz. Rs. 1,000/-, you, on your own admission, flatly denied having received the excess amount. On a report thereafter being made by Sm. Chowdhury to the Branch Manager, the latter enquired of you about the matter; but you did not acknowledge receipt of the excess amount of Rs. 1,000 from Sm. Chowdhury. When preliminary searches failed to trace the amount and a physical search of all employees present as being conducted, you, on your own admission, apprehensive of being caught red-handed, threw away the sum in question from your person on the floor.

The manner in which you acted in the instant case shows that you actually received an excess amount of Rs. 1,000 from Sm. Parul Rani Chowdhury, a constituent of the Bank, retained the amount with you with a criminal intent to misappropriate the same and thereby lowered the image of the Bank in the eyes of the public and thus acted in a manner highly prejudicial to the interest of the Bank.

2. Your reply to the above charge should reach the undersigned on or before 26th October, 1973 and the Bank will thereafter take such action against you as may be considered necessary."

The Branch Manager issued a Memorandum B M-1 which is Ext. E-2 dated 25 January, 1973 and is as follows :

"To Tarun Kr. Banerjee, Cashier,
State Bank of India,
Naktala.

No. B. M. I
State Bank of India
Incorporated in India under
the State Bank of India Act 1955
the Liability of the Members is Limited.
Naktala, 25th June, 1973.
Assr. 4, 1895 (Saka)

In connection with misappropriation of Rs. 1,000/- by you from the Deposit of Rs. 3,003 made by Smt. Parul Rani Chowdhury on behalf of Shri S.R. Chowdhury, on Saturday the 23rd June 1973. Please furnish your explanation immediately with detailed statements for Banks necessary action."

T.K. Banerjee denied the charge (See Ext. M-5).

He said :

"On the 25th June, 1975 the Branch Manager has issued a memorandum No. BM-1 to me directly involving me in an

alleged misappropriation allegedly held on the 23rd June 1973 and immediately after that he has compelled me to sign a typed letter which I was not allowed to go through even. Immediately after that he handed over to me another Memorandum No. B|M2 dated the 25th June, 1973, conveying my suspension order in connection with some alleged misappropriation of money.

Issuance of two memoranda to me and simultaneously getting signed one typed letter by me under coercion and all the three actions in connection with the above alleged misappropriation happening within a very short period gives me the impression that I am the victim of a serious conspiracy specially while after my recent promotion from a messenger to a Cashier I was looking forward for a brighter future to be achieved by more diligence, perseverance and honesty to works.

I again deny all the charges levelled against me and claim to be innocent."

2. It is to be noticed that the incident took place on 23 June, 1973. The charge-sheet was issued by the then branch manager on 10 October 1973 but there is no indication in the chargesheet as to who were the witnesses against T. K. Banerjee. The Enquiry Officer has based his finding on guilt mainly on the basis of the evidence of witnesses A. R. Dutt, the then branch manager and S.K. Mitra, Officer (grade II) who deposed that they saw personally T.K. Banerjee to throw the sum. The Enquiry Officer also considered one more fact viz. that the accusation made by Smt. Chowdhury was not general but quite specific against Sri Banerjee. On these evidences he came to the conclusion that Sri Banerjee, in order to avoid being caught red-handed threw the money having no other alternative. This finding cannot be sustained as correct for several reasons. The charge against Sri Banerjee is founded upon the complaint of Mrs. Parul Rani Chowdhury. That complaint was not exhibited before the Enquiry Officer. It is on record. Still the Enquiry Officer says that the accusation made by Smt. Chowdhury is not general but quite specific. He has thus relied on material which was not placed on record during enquiry. Neither Mrs. Parul Rani Chowdhury nor her husband was produced as witness. No explanation was offered by the management for not examining them as witness. Mrs. Parul Rani Chowdhury was the only proper and appropriate person to speak to the circumstances in which the excess amount of Rs. 1,000 is said to have been given to Sri Banerjee. If she would have been produced, the delinquent would have cross-examined her and would have elicited facts and circumstances relating to the money. Even her pass book was not filed. It may be

noted that according to the evidence of S. Roy Choudhury the present branch manager, she deposited Rs. 1,000 for credit of her savings bank account as per instruction of her husband. The lacuna was sought to be filled up by the evidence of A.R. Dutt to whom Mrs. Parul Rani Choudhury is alleged to have narrated the incident. Such hearsay evidence is difficult to act upon in the circumstances of this case. The excess one thousand was not found in the cash counter but on the floor near the wall at the end of the account's counter. It is at that place where the cashier Banerjee is said to have thrown the money. In my opinion the failure to examine the vital and material witnesses, viz., Mrs Parul Rani Choudhury and her husband torpedoes the entire adifice and vitiates the findings of the Enquiry Officer. Another peculiar feature of this case is that the charge-sheet mentions that on his own admission Sri Banerjee received an excess amount of Rs. 1,000. There is no evidence on record to show it. The charge-sheet next says that on his own admission Sri Banerjee retained the excess amount in his person with the intention of misappropriating the same. There is no evidence to support it. The charge-sheet next says that on his own admission Sri Banerjee flatly denied at 1.30 p.m. having received the excess amount to Smt. Parul Rani Choudhury. There is no evidence to prove it. The charge-sheet further says that on his own admission Sri Banerjee, apprehensive of being caught red-handed threw the money from his person on the floor. There is no evidence to support this assertion. The second portion of paragraph 1 of the charge-sheet runs thus:

"The manner in which you acted in the instant case shows that you actually received an excess amount of Rs. 1,000/- from Sm. Parul Rani Chowdhury, a constituent of the Bank, retained the amount with you with a criminal intent to misappropriate the same and thereby lowered the image of the Bank in the eyes of the public and thus acted in a manner highly prejudicial to the interest of the bank."

It is clear that the guilt of Sri Banerjee has been prejudged in the very charge-sheet itself. To me it seems that a plan was hatched up by some one in order to implicate Sri Banerjee for the purpose of dismissing him. The charge-sheet seems to have been issued with initial prejudice against him. The enquiry on the basis of such charge-sheet was a farce. The charge-sheet does not mention as to what evidence the management would give against the delinquent. The Enquiry Officer has not considered these matters in his report (Ext M-3). Sri Banerjee is said to have confessed. The confession was not exhibited by the management before the Enquiry Officer, and it is not on record. The documentary evidence

Exts E-1 and E-2 of the defence were merely referred to by the Enquiry Officer but not discussed. No opinion has been expressed by the Enquiry Officer as to the truth or otherwise of the defence case. The defence case was that at the relevant time i.e. in 1973 T K Banerjee was the only member of the INTUC Union, that is, the State Bank of India Employees Association (Bengal Circle) which was not recognised by the State Bank. That the State Bank of India Staff Association was the only recognised Association and that A R Dutt the then branch manager was out to trap him to get credit from the members of the Staff Association. Mr Banerjee thus alleged victimisation due to rivalry between the two Associations. According to the charge-sheet excess amount of Rs. 1,000/- was given to Sri Banerjee by Mrs Parul Rani Chowdhury. She is the wife of a businessman. It is not understandable as to how one thousand would be paid in excess when she had to give only two thousands for draft. It seems that later a story was cooked up that it was for her saving bank account. Admittedly A.R. Dutt, the former branch manager told about the incident to S Roy Chowdhury, the present branch manager of Naktala branch of the State Bank of India but S Roy Chowdhury does not say in his evidence that A R Dutta told him that the latter had seen Banerjee throwing the money. The evidence on record clearly falls short of supporting the charge and it may amount to a case where there is no reliable evidence in support of the allegation.

4. Learned Counsel for the concerned workman referred to para 521 of the Sastri Award and contended that as per allegation of the bank, the act of the delinquent amounted to an offence and the bank should have prosecuted him or get him prosecuted for that offence and should not have held departmental enquiry for misconduct. In other words, the contention is that the procedure of para 521 of the Sastri Award should have been followed. On the other hand, it was submitted on behalf of the management that criminal case has nothing to do with departmental trial and that departmental enquiry for misconduct in the present case was justified. In my opinion the contention raised on behalf of the workman has no merit. The concerned workman never challenged the validity of procedure during the enquiry. No prejudice has been shown by the adoption of the alleged wrong procedure. This point should have been taken when preliminary point was raised. The point is thus decided against the workman.

5. Learned Counsel for the management argued that the concerned workman never asked for production of the complainant during the domestic enquiry and that this court had held while hearing the preliminary point regarding the validity of the enquiry that natural justice was not violated. In my opinion, the argument is not valid.

The validity of the enquiry was confirmed to the points as to whether the delinquent was given reasonable opportunity to defend himself, as for example, by cross-examining the management's witnesses, by adducing his own evidence and whether proper procedure had been followed. At present I have to see whether there is proper evidence on record for sustaining his dismissal.

6. For the reasons already given I hold that there is no proper evidence on record to sustain the dismissal. I am satisfied that the order of dismissal was not justified. Accordingly, I set aside the dismissal and direct reinstatement of the concerned workmen, namely, T.K. Banerjee with full back wages and all consequential benefits to which he is entitled. He shall be deemed to have continued in service and he is entitled to all service benefits from his employer.

This is my award.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 14th June, 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012|32|78-D.II(A)]

S.O. 2929.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Union Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23-6-1983.

BEFORE JUSTICE SHRI K. K. DUBE, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

CASE NO. CGIT|LC(R)(37)|1978

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of the Union Bank of India, Bhopal and their workman, Shri Jabir Ali, Peon, in Bhopal Branch of the Bank represented through the M.P. Bank Employees Association, C/o United Commercial Bank, Marwari Road, Bhopal (M. P.)

APPEARANCES :

For workmen—Shri R. C. Bajpai, Advocate.

For Management—Shri Gulab Gupta and S.K. Rao, Advocates.

INDUSTRY : Bank DISTRICT : Bhopal (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated : June 10, 1983

After holding a departmental enquiry Jabir Ali, Peon in Bhopal Branch of the Union Bank of 409 GI/83—6

India was dismissed from services with effect from 31-5-1976. A dispute was raised by employees Union as regards his dismissal which came up before the Conciliation Officer who after several attempts of conciliation reported failure to the Central Government. The Central Government in exercise of its powers under Sec. 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 have now referred the dispute for adjudication vide Notification No. L-12012|6|78-D.II.A. dated 26/27-7-1978. The dispute is in following terms :—

“Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India, Bhopal in dismissing Shri Jabir Ali, Peon in Bhopal Branch of the Bank w.e.f. 31-5-76 vide Enquiry Officer's letter No. RO : MP: STF: 1900 dated 31-5-1976 which was confirmed by Asstt. General Manager vide his letter dated 12-6-76 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

2. The facts leading to the departmental enquiry against Jabir Ali and the other peon Phool Singh are these. One Shri G. I. Tanwani was having a Savings Bank Account in the Bank. His account No. is 1531. Blank Cheque books for the use of the clients are kept in an almirah in the custody of a responsible officer of the Bank. A Savings Bank Cheque book bearing Cheque Nos. 36426 to 36440 was stolen. Out of this Cheque book a Cheque bearing No. 36439 was used for forging a Cheque of Rs. 800. On 18-11-1972 Jabir Ali made withdrawals from the Bank, one of Rs. 60 which was drawn from his own Saving Bank Account by presenting a withdrawal slip and second of Rs. 100 which was drawn from the account of his wife, Mrs. Naseem Begum by presenting a cheque payable in favour of Jabir Ali. On the same day the forged cheque of Rs. 800 purporting to be drawn by Shri G. I. Tanwani was presented. The cheque was payable to self and bore falsely the signatures of Shri Tanwani at the back. According to the management, Jabir Ali along with the two withdrawal also presented this forged cheque. He obtained token Nos. 19 and 20 for the withdrawals of Rs. 60 and Rs. 100 and token No. 21 for the forged cheque. These withdrawals were entered into the Scroll Register. Jabir Ali, according to the management, gave these three tokens to Phool Singh who obtained payments from the Cashier. The forged cheque of Rs. 800 had not been debited to the ledger of Shri Tanwani. In the evening when the accounts were tried to be tallied it was found that the cheque of Rs. 800 was missing. This cheque had been surreptitiously removed and therefore it could not be found along with the other documents of the Bank. A voucher of Rs. 800 had therefore to be prepared to show the transaction. It was soon found out that a fraud had been practised on the Bank and a cheque

forged in the name of Shri Tanwani for Rs. 800 was encashed.

3. It is fully brought out from the evidence that Shri Tanwani had not drawn the cheque of Rs. 800 and a cheque had been forged in his name and money obtained from the Bank. This cheque was not from the Cheque Book issued to Shri Tanwani but from a Cheque Book stolen from the Bank. Question is as to whether Jabir Ali was the person who had practised the fraud. Jabir Ali was charged with the following charges :—

That he entered in a conspiracy with Phool Singh to perpetrate a fraud on the bank. A Savings Bank Account Cheque bearing nos. 36426 to 36440 was stolen from the Bank's records, out of which cheque No. 36439 for Rs. 800 was forged on the Savings Bank Account No. 1531 in the name of Mr. G. I. Tanwani. This cheque was presented on 18-11-72 with two withdrawals for Rs. 60 and Rs. 100 drawn on account of Jabir Ali and Mrs. Naseem Begum wife of Jabir Ali and token Nos. 19, 20 and 21 were obtained and payment of these cheques were received from the paying cashier by Phool Singh. The forged cheque for Rs. 800 drawn on account of Shri G. I. Tanwani was subsequently removed from the record of the Bank.

On the above allegations Jabir Ali was charged of gross misconduct—(1) misappropriation of funds (2) doing acts of highly prejudicial to the interest of the Bank.

4. A departmental enquiry held against Jabir Ali was conducted by Shri Ram Sharma who came to the conclusion that Jabir Ali and Phool Singh in collusion had withdrawn money against a forged cheque with the sole intention of defrauding the Bank and misappropriating it. Enquiry Officer after a show cause notice as to why Jabir Ali and Phool Singh should not be dismissed, the workmen were dismissed. Papers were then placed before the Asstt. General Manager, Department of Personnel (I.R. Cell) who was also of the opinion that the dismissal by the Enquiry Officer on 31-5-1975 was wholly merited. The dismissed employees thereafter filed an appeal before the Managing Director. In the meantime, the Central Government had referred the dispute for adjudication.

5. Before this Tribunal validity of the departmental enquiry was challenged on various grounds. This Tribunal came to the conclusion by an order dated 22-1-1981 that the enquiry was vitiated at it violated the principles of natural justice and had not been conducted fairly. The order of the Tribunal was challenged in the High Court in a writ

petition. A Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court upheld the order of the Tribunal and dismissed the petition filed by the management. Therefore as far as the departmental enquiry is concerned the same is of no assistance in holding Jabir Ali guilty. The Tribunal had permitted the Bank to lead evidence to establish the misconduct against Jabir Ali. The parties therefore led evidence, oral and documentary. I have now to see whether on the evidence on record the misconduct against Jabir Ali is made out and whether the punishment of dismissal meted out to him is justified.

6. The management has led the evidence of a number of witnesses to prove the procedure as to how a cheque would be passed when presented to a Bank. The procedure followed is generally that when a cheque was presented for payment it was received by the clerk incharge of the Scroll Register. After receiving the cheque he hands over the token to the person presenting the cheque. The cheque then goes to the ledger clerk; the ledger clerk then verifies the account in the light of the cheque drawn, also verifies that the cheque is from the cheque book which was issued to the account holder; then he puts the folio number with his initials and sends it to the passing officer. The passing officer then verifies the cheque and genuineness of the cheque and forward it to the Cash Branch with his endorsement for the cheque being passed for payment. It has been fully made out on the evidence of Amrit Lal Kalra, Branch Manager (MW. 2), K. A. Thakkar (M.W. 4), Ashok Kumar Umathe (M.W. 5), Surendra Kumar Atri (M.W. 6), B. L. Jaiswal (M.W. 7), Mohd. Abdul Wali (M.W. 8) and U. P. Vaidya (M.W. 1) that a blank Savings Cheque Book was stolen. The blank cheque books are kept in the custody of the Accountant but the peons have an access to it and it was possible that a peon could have stolen the cheque book. This is clear from Kalra's evidence. It is easy to see that usually nobody would suspect the Bank's peons who are asked to do various duties of bringing out documents from the almirah and such place of safety.

7. From the register filed by the Bank it is established that the cheque book, of which a cheque has been used for forgery, was not issued to Shri Tanwani, the Savings Bank holder. The cheque book came in possession of the person who had forged the signatures of Shri Tanwani and drew a cheque of Rs. 800 on Tanwani's Savings Bank Account No. 1531. Now it is also proved that this forged cheque was presented on 18th November, 1972 and on the same date Jabir Ali had presented two withdrawal slips one of Rs. 60 (Ex. M/34) operating on his Savings Bank Account No. 371 for which he had been issued token no. 19 and another withdrawal for a sum of Rs. 100 drawn on Savings Bank Account No. 2062 being cheque of his wife, Mrs. Naseem Begum (Ex. M/35) for

which he was given token no. 20. These two withdrawals were presented by Jabir Ali. This is clear from the evidence of Surendra Kumar Atri (M.W. 6). Another important fact then is that the aforesaid payments of Ex. M/35 and Ex. M/34 under token nos. 19 and 20 were paid along with the forged cheque of Rs. 800 under token no. 21. The forged cheque was payable to self and purported to bear the signatures of the drawer and payee at the back. According to the evidence of Vaidya, token nos. 19, 20 and 21 were brought by Phool Singh to him for payment. The payment of all these three withdrawals were made by him to Phool Singh. According to him, one V. S. Mishra had issued the tokens in respect of all the three withdrawals. Vaidya says that cheques in respect of which token nos. 19, 20 and 21 were issued and presented by Jabir Ali. The statement was made on the basis of information from someone in the Bank and he did not have any personal knowledge about the same. Mohd. Wali says that Vaidya informed him that payments in Ex. M/35, Ex. M/34 and the missing forged cheque for Rs. 800 were received by the Bank's peon, Phool Singh. Surendra Kumar Atri deposed that on 18th November, 1972 Jabir Ali had under Ex. M/34 and Ex. M/35 presented withdrawals of Rs. 60 and Rs. 100 under token nos. 19 and 20. He, however, does not have any personal knowledge as to who had presented the forged cheque of Rs. 800 for which token no. 21 was issued.

8. It is pertinent to note here that the forged cheque of Rs. 800 was found missing. According to the witnesses, before payment could be made on the basis of the cheque it must have passed before several officers and ordinarily they must have been checked it. Now the first duty is to see whether there is a balance to meet the cheque amount; there is then a scrutiny whether the cheque is in order; there is an officer who verifies the signatures of the drawer; it is also verified whether the cheque is out of the cheque book issued to such an account holder. If the cheque is found in order in all respects then an officer has to pass the cheque for payment. It then goes to the cashier and the person having the token in respect of these cheques receives the payment. It cannot be disputed that in respect of this cheque there must have been some negligence and there must have been some persons mixed up in the fraud. The cheque before being sent for payment the cash is debited to the drawer's account. Such a cheque bears the folio number of the account holder and initials of the passing officer. The signatures are cancelled. The cheque is entered into the scroll of the officer; cashier also enters into his scroll; the cheque must bear the signatures of the payee and ordinarily the signatures for the payment is also taken on the back. He would pay the cheque amount to the person who delivered the token.

9. It is well established from the evidence that Shri Tanwani did not draw the cheque of Rs. 800 and a cheque had been forged in his name on a stolen cheque from the Bank and money obtained for it. This cheque was paid on token no. 21. A false document (cheque forged) was made. A stolen Bank cheque was used to defraud the Bank. Though the cheque was shown to be signed by Tanwani it was not so and it was a forgery. Further this cheque after it had been cashed was removed from the Bank. With its disappearance also disappeared some valuable evidence regarding the person who had passed the same. A voucher had, therefore, to be prepared in respect of this cheque. By evening of the same day it was known that a fraud had been perpetrated on the Bank and Bank lost Rs. 800. If Jabir Ali's complicity in this fraud is proved the conduct was highly prejudicial to the interest of the Bank. Such a misconduct would demand severe penalty.

10. Jabir Ali has totally denied having presented this forged cheque at the counter. There is no evidence to show that he had given token no. 21 to Phool Singh. There is no evidence as regards conspiracy between him and Phool Singh. The only little evidence that remains is that the payments for token nos. 19, 20 and 21 were obtained in one transaction by Phool Singh. But this circumstance is in sufficient to establish Jabir Ali's participation in the fraud. Payment for token nos. 19 and 20 were with respect to Jabir Ali's withdrawals. According to Vaidya, V. S. Mishra was the person who had issued tokens in respect of that date. V. S. Mishra has not been examined by the Bank. Vaidya's statement that token nos. 20 and 21 were issued to Jabir Ali is not based on his personal knowledge. Ex. M/29 states that cheque was presented by Jabir Ali. There is, however, no basis for this statement. On the departmental enquiry, the proceedings of which have been quashed, some evidence of conspiracy as also of presentation of cheque by Jabir Ali was given, but this evidence now cannot be read. In the above circumstances, it cannot be said that Jabir Ali presented the cheque or had given token no. 21 to Phool Singh for obtaining cash from the cashier. I, therefore, find that there is no evidence against Jabir Ali to hold him guilty of the misconduct alleged against him. I am holding that Phool Singh is guilty of misconduct in a separate award in reference made in connection with the same incident and Phool Singh's complicity in the fraud is proved. Since no conspiracy is proved between Jabir Ali and Phool Singh, Jabir Ali cannot be held to have taken part in the fraud. Since the Bank has failed to prove the misconduct against him, his dismissal from services was not in accordance with law and has to be set aside. He would, therefore, be reinstated. He will be paid full back

wages if Jabir Ali had not been gainfully employed anywhere else and/or receiving remuneration during such period or part thereof. In case he is gainfully employed the remuneration received by him would be deducted from the amount payable to him. This award is, therefore, made holding that the management of Union Bank of India, Bhopal was not justified in dismissing Jabir Ali, peon in Bhopal Branch of the Bank with effect from 31st May, 1976. The domestic enquiry, the findings of which were confirmed by the Assistant General Manager, was not proper and has been quashed by an earlier order. The workman is entitled to be reinstated with back wages provided the amount if any received by him during this period in any gainful employment shall be deducted. In the peculiar circumstances of the case there shall be no order as to costs.

K. K. DUBE, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012/6/87-D.II(A)]

S.O. 2930.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Madras, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 21-6-1983.

BEFORE THIRU T. ARULRAJ, B.A., B.L.,
PRESIDING OFFICER,
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, TAMIL NADU, MADRAS

(Constituted by the Government of India)

Thursday, the 9th day of June, 1983

Industrial Dispute No. 14 of 1982

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 between the workmen and the Management of State Bank of India, Madras.)

BETWEEN

The workmen represented by
The General Secretary,
State Bank Employees Union,
No. 157, Angappa Naicken Street, Madras-1.

AND

The Manager, State Bank of India,
21, North Beach Road, Madras-1.

REFERENCES:

Order No. L-12012(190)/81-D. II(A), dated 25-2-1982
of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India,
New Delhi.

This dispute coming on this day for final hearing upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other connected papers on record and upon hearing of Thiru K. Chandru for Thiruvalargal Row and Reddy, Advocates for the workmen and of Thiru Sanjay Mohan for King and Partridge, Advocates appearing for the Management and the parties having made joint endorsement settling the dispute and recording the same, this Tribunal made the following.

AWARD

This dispute arises out of a reference under Section 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government

of India in Order No. L-12012(190)/81-D.II(A), dated 25-2-1982 of the Ministry of Labour for adjudication of the following issue:

"Whether the action of the Management of State Bank of India in relation to their Coonoor Branch in denying full wages to Smt. V. Pushpam, Part-time Sweeper with effect from 1-9-71 to 30-6-80 and in changing her working hour from 34 hours to 29 hours with effect from 21-6-80 is justified. If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

(2) Parties were served with summons for the hearing on 24-3-1982.

(3) Petitioner-Union filed its claim statement on 14-5-1982 putting forth their claims. In repudiation thereof, the Respondent-Management has filed its counter statement denying the allegations in the claim statement. Documents were also filed by the Union on 17-7-1982.

(4) After several adjournments, when the dispute was called today, the counsel for the Management made an endorsement that the Bank is agreeable to make the worker V. Pushpam as a full time employee (Sweeper) with effect from 1-1-1983 with attendant benefits and an award may be passed to that effect. The General Secretary of the Union on behalf of the worker V. Pushpam agreed the above terms.

(5) The joint endorsement is perused and the terms thereof are reasonable and therefore it is accepted.

(6) Hence, an award is passed in terms of the joint endorsement. Arrears to the worker will be paid by the Management within a month from the date of this Award.

(7) No costs.

Dated, this 9th day of June, 1983.

T. ARULRAJ, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal.
[No. L-12012/190/81.D.II(A)]

S.O. 2931.—In pursuance of section 1 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which as received by the Central Government on 23-6-1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

Reference No. 82 of 1981

In the matter of an industrial dispute under
S.10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of
State Bank of India and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers.—Shri B. N.
Bhardwaj, Administrative Officer.

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri G. K.
Verma, General Secretary, State Bank
of India Employees Union.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Bank.

Dhanbad, the 18th June, 1983

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its order No. 12012/304/80-D.II(A) dated 19th December, 1981 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDELE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Patna in dismissing from service of the Bank Shri K. K. Mandal, Clerk-Typist in Bhagalpur Branch of the Bank with effect from 28-2-76 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?"

2. The concerned workman Shri K. K. Mondal was appointed as a clerk-typist in January, 1966 at Chaibasa branch of the State of Bank of India. He was transferred to Bhagalpur branch and joined at Bhagalpur on 6-3-72. While at Bhagalpur he said to have committed misconduct for which he was formally charged under three heads. He is said to have displayed riotous, disorderly and indecent behaviour in the premises of the bank with the intent to harass and assault the bank Agent. He also showed wilful insubordination and disobedience to the reasonable orders of the Bank. He was asked to show cause and the cause shown by him was shown to be unsatisfactory and a domestic enquiry was ordered to be made. In the meantime he was suspended on 7-2-73.

3. Shri S. K. Ghosh was appointed enquiry officer. He held one or two sittings whereafter he retired from service. Hence, Shri S. S. Goyal, a Staff Officer, Grade II was appointed as enquiry officer. The enquiry was conducted by Shri Goyal and he found—

- (a) The concerned workman snatched away paper from Shri Rau, the Branch Agent and threw them into the tray and behaved in an arrogant manner.
- (b) He showed riotous behaviour in the office premises,
- (c) He assaulted Shri R. S. Singh, clerk-typist.

4. The enquiry officer recommended his dismissal as the above charges had been proved. The management required Shri K. K. Mondal to submit a show cause and he was permitted a personal hearing by the Disciplinary Authority on 27-2-76. His explanation was found to be unsatisfactory and so he was dismissed from service. The concerned workman preferred an appeal and the Appellate authority found that the charge of gross

misconduct was proved and therefore there was no reason to modify the order of the Disciplinary authority, and so rejected the appeal.

5. An industrial dispute was raised and since conciliation ended in failure the present reference has been made for adjudication as per schedule mentioned above.

6. On behalf of the concerned workman a written statement has been filed. His case shortly stated is that the officers of the State Bank of India combined to victimise him. While at Chaibasa the concerned workman had some difference with his wife whose parents belong to Bhagalpur. In order to bring about re-conciliation the concerned workman took leave and went to Bhagalpur to meet his father-in-law. On return to Chaibasa he learnt that the Branch Manager of the bank Shri Choudhury had obtained some written representation from his wife. He wanted a photostate copy of that representation from the bank Manager which he later received. Due to this incident there was some differences between him and the branch Manager, and this led to his suspension and subsequent transfer to Bhagalpur against his wishes. The concerned workman had written to various authorities about the conduct of Shri Choudhury in the matter of his personal affairs between him and his wife. Even after his transfer to Bhagalpur he was a subject matter of ridicule at the hands of the staff of the office and the branch Agent Shri Rau was also unsympathetic towards him. According to him an absolutely false charge sheet was framed against him. About the domestic enquiry his case is that he was not given proper opportunity to defend himself and even cross-examination of witnesses was not permitted by the enquiry officer. He has alleged that he wanted certain documents to be placed on the record but the enquiry officer refused on the ground that those were not relevant to the case. He was not even permitted to cross-examine the witnesses by the order of the enquiry officer. His contention is that although the evidences indicated that the charges had not been proved, the enquiry officer held without any basis that the charges had been proved. He has alleged that the Appellate Authority unduly delayed the consideration of the appeal and without considering the evidence adduced before the enquiry officer, dismissed his appeal. According to him the principle of natural justice was not followed by the enquiry officer and his report was perverse. He has contended that the management took a very harsh and vindictive attitude in inflicting the punishment of dismissal although in respect of other delinquents charged with similar offences were lightly punished. His prayer is that the order of dismissal may be set-aside and he should be reinstated with all back wages and other emoluments w.e.f. the date of dismissal.

7. In this reference a belated petition was led on behalf of the management to give a preliminary decision as to whether the domestic enquiry was fair and proper. Most of the documents in connection with the domestic enquiry were taken into evidence without any formal proof and many of the documents filed on behalf of the workman were also taken into evidence without formal proof. The entire enquiry proceeding is on the record of this case and the workman is also satisfied that all his documents are in evidence in this case. At the time of argument on preliminary question both the parties agreed that the case would be heard on merits irrespective of the question as to whether the domestic enquiry was fair or not. In a case of this nature where dismissal is involved, the dispute is under Section 11A of the J.D. Act, 1947. This contains a special provision that in case a preliminary hearing is given on the question on fairness or propriety on domestic enquiry and it is held that the domestic enquiry is not fair and proper, the management gets a right to adduce evidence in this Court for appraisal of the evidence on the basis of which the order of dismissal was passed. Since in this case both the parties have agreed that the evidence adduced before the enquiry officer should be gone into for the purpose of assessment as to whether the finding of guilt by the enquiry officer can be sustained. So instead of going into the question as to whether the domestic enquiry is fair or proper, we shall at once proceed to look into evidence in order to find out whether the charges have been proved in order to justify the case of dismissal. I must however, mention that in course of domestic enquiry the workman and the enquiry officer have not proceeded as they should have done. The workman was insistant at several steps to bring in strenuous matters unconnected with the offence alleged. For instance, while at Chaibasa he had a good deal of difference with the Branch Agent there and the concerned workman had complained in writing against him to the higher authorities. He had an imagined grievance that the higher officers of the bank who had wanted to oust him from service. Perhaps such an impression had been the product of an unhappy domestic life which the concerned workman had at Chaibasa. Even at Bhagalpur he felt that he was a matter of ridicule at the hands of some of the staff particularly one who was related to him through his wife. But there is nothing to indicate that the branch manager Shri Rau had anything to do in aggravating his grievances. I have mentioned these things to serve as a background of the charges that have been framed against the concerned workman and also the manner in which the enquiry was conducted. It is worth-mentioning that the concerned workman put obstacles in the way of domestic enquiry on almost all stages. The enquiry officer also felt very much exasperated and at one stage stopped him from participation the proceeding. He also stopped him from asking questions which

were not relevant and stopped him from cross-examining the witness No. 6 for the management. It is apparent that the enquiry did not proceed in a peaceful manner and mostly on account of the non-cooperative attitude of the concerned workman. But as I have said above, it is better that we look into the evidence in order to see whether the evidence justifies the charges that have been framed against the concerned workman.

8. We shall now consider whether the charges levelled against the concerned workman have been substantiated by evidence at the enquiry stages. Charge No. 1 covers 3 parts. Charge No. 1 covers 8 parts. In part 1 the allegation is that in the forenoon of 3-7-72 Shri K. K. Mondal entered the chamber of the Branch Manager and insisted that the Agent should contact head offices at Patna over telephone in order to settle his dispute. The second part shows that the concerned workman was leaning over his shoulder and interfering with his work, and when the Agent did not exceed to his request he snatched away the list of registered letters and threw the same for the wooden tray. The third part says that after the aforesaid incident the concerned workman again entered the chamber of the Agent and abused him saying "You are first class liar and I hate to talk with a third rate man like you". Again towards the evening on the same day he entered into the chamber and demanded he should telephone head office to settle his matter.

9. It will appear that in all the three parts of the first charge the occurrence is of 3-7-72. I will cut short the discussions because the enquiry officer has simply found that the concerned workman was guilty of snatching away the papers from the hand of Shri Rau, the Branch Agent and throwing them into the tray behaving in an arrogant manner. The only evidence on this point is of the Branch Agent Shri Rau who is witness No. 6. It will appear from his evidence that he admitted in cross-examination that the concerned workman visited his chamber only once. The charge shows that he gave four visits. The enquiry officer in his report has said that there is no evidence available regarding the first and last para of charge No. 1. He has relied upon the evidence of PW7 Shri Lekhan Mondal, Jamadar on the point that Shri Mondal snatched some papers from the hand of Shri Rau and threw them on the tray. He has also said that Shri Mondal abused him. But on this point the Agent does not support. Now even if the concerned workman behaved in a unseemly manner, it could not be said to be a serious charge justifying his dismissal.

10. Let us proceed to charge No. 2. The second charge is in respect of an occurrence on 4-7-72. Shri K. K. Mondal went into the chamber of Branch Agent and demanded a copy of his letter to the head office and started shouting at the

top of his voice. He also said to have insulted Shri R. B. Singh, typist/clerk in the chamber of the Agent. After a few minutes Shri K. K. Mondal again entered the Agent's chamber, held him with one hand and with the other hand took away from his table an wooden trey and attempted to throw it on him. The enquiry officer has found that Shri Mondal made an attempt to throw the trey towards the Agent. It will appear that Shri Rau himself has not categorically said that any attempt was made by the concerned workman to catch his hand with one hand and to snatch the trey with the other to throw at him. Similarly PW-4 Callar Gope has also not said like this. Moreover, Shri Anil Kumar Bose has his office located in the chamber of the Agent. He has not supported the case of the management on the first charge or the second charge although he was all along present. It will therefore appear that there is no clear proof on the point that the concerned workman manhandled the Branch Agent or attempted to assault him with wooden trey. The subject matter of the second charge is that on 4-7-72 the concerned workman in the tiffin room assaulted Shri R.B. Singh, clerk/typist with his tea cup as a result of which he sustained bleeding injury and was examined by Doctor. He also made a complaint in writing. On this point Shri R. B. Singh has said that he did not see the concerned workman throwing tea cup at him. His clear evidence is that the tea cup came and struck him from the direction where the concerned workman was sitting. PW-7 however, has said that the concerned workman had thrown a tea cup at Shri R. B. Singh in the tiffin room. On behalf of the concerned workman it has been said that the broken tea cup has not been produced to show that any occurrence took place. Even according to PW-7 they were 7 to 8 persons in that room all sitting and gossiping and taking tea in the tiffin room. None of these persons have come to support the occurrence. It has also been argued that the medical certificate was not produced by the management in order to show that Shri R. B. Singh sustained an injury specially when the case is that he had gone to a doctor. I agree that the evidence produced by the management on this point is not convincing and therefore the enquiry officer should have at least given him a benefit of doubt, specially when Shri R. B. Singh who is said to have received injury did not accuse Shri K. K. Mondal to have assaulted him with tea cup.

11. On consideration of the evidence on all the three charges framed against the concerned workman I am bound to conclude that the charges have not been proved satisfactorily and beyond all shadow of doubt. Moreover, the charges are very simple in nature and even he found guilty, the concerned workman could not have been given the punishment of dismissal.

12. In the light of the above discussion the reference is answered as below :

The action of the management of State Bank of India, Patna, in dismissing from service of the Bank Shri K. K. Mondal, clerk/typist in Bhagalpur branch of the bank with effect from 28-2-76 is not justified. Consequently, the concerned workman should be deemed to be in the service of the bank on 28-2-76 and he is entitled to all the back wages and other emoluments with effect from 28-2-76.

This is my award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer,
Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal (No. 2)
Dhanbad.

[No. L-12012/304/80-D. II(A)]

N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer.

New Delhi, the 27th June, 1983

S.O. 2932.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th June, 1983.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
CALCUTTA**

Reference No. 11 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust

AND

Their workmen.

PRESFNT :

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers—Mr. D. K. Mukherjee, Industrial Relations Officer.

On behalf of Workmen—Mr. Ashoke Ghosh, an official of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Port

AWARD

By Order No. L-32011(16)/81-D.IV(A) dated 2nd April, 1982 the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Calcutta Port Trust in debarring the workmen permanently from their future promotion, if they once refused to accept the offer of promotion is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

2. It appears that the dispute between the parties arose because of the issue of circular dated 26 March, 1980 (Ext. M-2) by the management which contains the decision of the management to the effect that in case of refusal by an employee, his case for promotion in future will not be considered again. I think this circular should be applicable only in

those cases where an employee declines to accept the promotion for all time of his service life. Experience shows that many a time it happens that an employee declines to accept the promotion only for the occasion when it is offered to him for personal reasons. I think he should not be punished for all time of his service career in such cases. I am glad that no employee has suffered till now. At the time of hearing Sri D. K. Mukherjee appearing for the management and Shri Ghosh appearing for the Union agreed that if an employee gives his refusal in writing that he is declining to accept the promotional post only for the time being his case will be considered next time. The refusal may be expressed in his own words but both parties agreed that the refusal may be in the following terms :

"I refuse to accept the present promotion to the higher post which is now being offered to me, for personal reasons. However, if, in future, any promotional post to which I may be eligible is to be filled up, I shall be considered and the present non-acceptance will not prejudice my future chance of promotion."

Both parties further agreed that if such refusal in writing is not given by an employee who refuses the promotional post, then it will be taken that he has refused for all the time and in that case he will not be considered for promotion in future. But if refusal is given in writing then he shall be considered in future for the promotional post and the present non-acceptance will not be a bar to his future chance.

3. Before I part with this case I must say that I highly appreciate the attitude adopted by both the parties before me. It will certainly maintain industrial peace. The reference is disposed of in terms of agreement aforesaid.

N.P. SINGH, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-32011(16)/81-D.IV(A)]
R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer.

Dated, Calcutta,
The 4th June, 1983.

नई दिल्ली, 15 जून, 1983

का० आ० 2933.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया मंहिता, 1973 (1974 का 3) की धारा 25 की उपधारा (1क) द्वारा प्रदत्त ग्रक्षितयों का प्रयोग करते हुए खान सुरक्षा महानिदेशालय में विधि सहायक सर्वश्री आर० मिह, ए० सौ० धारागुप्ता, सुभाष प्रसाद और विपत्ता लाकड़ा को, खान अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) के अधीन उन राज्यों थांकों में, जहाँ उक्त अधिनियम का विस्तार है, मैजिस्ट्रेटों के सभी न्यायालयों के समक्ष अभियोजन मामलों का संचालन करने के लिए, सहायक लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० एस-29016/2/82-प्र०. 1]
जै० कौ० जैन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th June, 1983

S.O. 2933.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1A) of section 25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri R. Singh, A. C. Dhargupta, Subhash Prasad and Bipta Lakra, Law Assistants in the Directorate General of Mines Safety as Assistant Public Prosecutors to conduct prosecution cases launched under the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952) before all courts of Magistrates in the territories to which the said Act extends.

[No. S-29016/2/82-MI]
J. K. JAIN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 28th June, 1983

S.O. 2934.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Co. Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 22nd June, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3,

DHANBAD

Reference No. 41/81

PRESENT :

Shri J. N. Singh, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Co. Ltd., Dalmianagar,

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri D. Mukherjee, Advocate.
For the Workmen—None.

INDUSTRY : Railway

STATE : Bihar.

Dhanbad, the 15th June, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/s 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-41011 (20)/81-D. II. (B) dated the 17th September, 1981.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management in not accepting the old system of office hours for staff working in the General Building at Dalmianagar consequent upon the termination of mutual agreement dated 1-12-1979 is justified ? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled ?"

2. The case of the workmen is that the alleged settlement dated 1-12-79 fixing office hours of the staff of General Office from 8 a.m. to 12 p.m. and 1-30 p.m. to 5-30 p.m. is illegal and unauthorised and is not binding on the employees of the Railways in as much as it was arrived at on behalf of the employees by persons who did not legally and fully represented them. It is submitted that the alleged settlement fixing 8 hours duty is harmful for the employees without any provision for a fair return to them. It is also stated that 2 increments were paid to the employees in the said settlement but the benefit is nominal one. According to them, the alleged settlement has been legally and validly terminated because it never existed in the eyes of law and hence the old system of office hours may kindly be revived.

3. The case of the management on the other hand is that the present Reference is not maintainable at all. According to them the settlement was legally and validly arrived at between the sponsoring union and the management and it is still in force and binding on them as it has not been legally terminated and no notice as required U/s 19(2) of the Industrial Dispute Act has been given by the union as such there has been no valid termination of the said settlement. Further it is submitted the said settlement is incapable of being terminated as it imposes a continuous obligation as 2 increments were given to the employees when

the said settlement was arrived at and they are still getting the same. It is also stated that the said office hours was fixed keeping in view the work of the management.

4. The point for consideration is as to whether the action of the management in not accepting the old system of office hours for staff working in the General Office consequent upon the termination of settlement dated 1-12-79 is justified. If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled.

5. It will appear that the present dispute has been raised by the Union known as Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Employees Union. Ext. M-1 is the memorandum of settlement dated 1-12-79 arrived at between the management of the Dehri Rohtas Light Railway and its workmen represented by the same union i.e. the Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Employees Union, Dalmianagar. The signatory to the said settlement is Sri Dwarika Singh, General Secretary of the union as well as six of its employees. On behalf of the management, however, it is signed by the Chief Executive and the Personnel Officer. By this settlement it was agreed that the workmen employed in General Office shall work 8 hours a day and six days in a week as per time mentioned in the settlement and further that from the date of settlement 2 special increments in the existing grade shall be allowed to each category of workmen employed in the general building. Thus a valid agreement was arrived at between the sponsoring union as also the management. MW-1 who is the Law Assistant of the management has stated that in terms of the said settlement the employees are being given 2 increments till to-day and it is supported from the pay sheet Ext. M-2 filed by the management.

6. Section 19 of the Industrial Disputes Act provides about the period for which a settlement is to remain in force. Sub-section (2) provides that such settlement shall be binding for such period as is agreed upon by the parties and if no such period is agreed upon for a period of six months from the date on which the memorandum of settlement is signed by the parties to the dispute, and shall continue to be binding on the parties after the expiry of the period aforesaid, until the expiry of two months from the date on which a notice in writing of an intention to terminate the settlement is given by one of the parties to the other party or parties to the settlement. The question, therefore, is as to whether such a notice terminating the settlement was given by the union or not. It will appear that the present dispute was raised by the union before the A.L.C. by their letter Ext. M-3 dated 11-2-80. Ext. M-4 is a letter of the A.L.C. informing the management about the date for discussion on this issue. Thus it is clear that the dispute was raised before the A.L.C. on 11-2-80. By that date no notice terminating the settlement had been sent by the union to the management. For the first time the notice of termination was sent on 24-3-80 vide Ext. M-5 and prior to that another notice signed by the workmen had been sent to the management by application dated 6-3-80 (Ext. M-6). Thus it will appear that though the notices terminating the settlement was sent in the month of March '80 but the dispute was raised on 11-2-80 much prior to that. The notice, therefore, cannot be said to be a legal and valid one nor the present Reference can be held to be legal and valid as the dispute was raised before any notice terminating the settlement was sent by the union. It is also well settled by the ruling reported in 1981 Supreme Court Cases page 111 (Life Insurance Corporation of India Vs. D. J. Bahadur and others) that settlement and awards under the Industrial Disputes Act cease to operate only when replaced by fresh settlement or award and it continues to operate even after service of notice and lapse of two months subsequent thereto contemplated U/s 19(2) and terminates only when replaced by another settlement or award. The only effect of the notice is that if no notice is given the door for raising an industrial dispute and fresh conditions of service is not legally open but it is open after a notice of termination of settlement is given. In this particular case the employees are still getting the fruits of the settlement in question that is they are getting two increments even till the present day. The settlement in question has not been replaced by any fresh settlement or award till to-day. In such view of the matter the settlement is still binding on the 409 GI/83-7.

parties and the office hours as contemplated in it will continue to remain in force. It is strange that the same union who entered into the settlement has raised the present dispute even without sending a notice U/s 19(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

7. Considering these, I hold that the action of the management in not accepting the old system of office hours is fully justified. The workmen, in the circumstances are not entitled to any relief.

8. The award is given accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-41011/20/81-D. II(B)]

आवेदन

नई दिल्ली, 2 जूलाई, 1983

का०मा० 2935:—केन्द्रीय सरकार जी राय है कि कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में समन्वेषी मात्रायकी परियोजना विशाखापत्तनम के प्रबंधतांत्र से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को व्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना चाहती है,

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा(I) के खंड (प) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासात्र अधिकारी श्री एस०वी० रामन रेड्डी होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैंदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को व्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुमति

म्या उप निदेशक, समन्वेषी मात्रायकी परियोजना की, श्री पी० सत्यराजू की बीस वर्ष से अनियमित सेवा में नेट मैटर जूनियर डाकहैड के रूप में आकस्मिक सेवा की उपेक्षा करके रोजगार कार्यालय द्वारा प्रायोजित एक नए अम्बर्धी का चयन करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है। यदि नहीं तो श्री पी० सत्यराजू किस अनुतोष का हकदार है :

हरी सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी
[मं० ए.ल०-42012(40)/82-डेरक-II(वी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 1983

S.O. 2935.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Exploratory Fisheries Project,

Visakhapatnam and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri S. V. Ramana Reddy shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Deputy Director, Exploratory Fisheries Project, Visakhapatnam in selection a fresh candidate sponsored through the Employment Exchange ignoring 20 years of casual service put in as a Net Mender/Junior Deckhand by Shri P. Satyaraju is justified ? If not, to what relief Shri P. Satyaraju is entitled ?"

[No. L-42012(40)/82-D.II(B)]

HARI SINGH, Desk Officer

आदेश

नई विन्ली, 8 जून, 1983

का.आ. 2936 :—इससे उपायक अनुसूची में विनियोग औद्योगिक विवाद, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, नई विन्ली के समक्ष लिखित है।

और चंडीगढ़ में एक नया केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय स्थापित किया गया है जिसकी अधिकारियों के अन्तर्गत जम्मू-कश्मीर, रंजाम, हरियाणा, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य और चंडीगढ़ संघ राज्य क्षेत्र आते हैं ;

अनु : अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 33बा द्वारा प्रदत्त एकिनियों का प्रयोग कारते हुए, उक्त एकिनियों से जो केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, नई विन्ली के समक्ष लिखित हैं, संविधान कर्यवाहियों को वापस लेती है और उन्हें केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, चंडीगढ़ को इस निवेश के साथ अंतरिन फरती है कि उसने अधिकरण एमी कार्यवाहियों के संबंध में उस प्रकार से अग्रसर होगा जिस पर वे उसे अंतरित की गई हैं और उसने विधि के अनुसार निपटाएगी ।

अनुसूची

क्रम केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय का आवेदन संघर्ष सं० न्यायालय, विन्ली के समक्ष लिखें आई जी सं० और तारीख

1	2	3	4
1. आई० डी० सं० 107/80	एल-12012/83/79 डी० 2 ए 2-8-80	अश्विनी कुमार शर्मा बनाम ऑरिएन्टल बैंक आफ कामर्स	
2. आई० डी० सं० 75/83	एल-12012/182/81 डी० 2 ए- 12-2-82	रणजीत सिंह बनाम ऑरिएन्टल बैंक आफ कामर्स	
3. आई० डी० सं० 106/81	एल-12012/35/81 डी० 2 ए- 3-8-81	अमरजीत कौर बनाम ऑरिएन्टल बैंक आफ कामर्स	
4. आई० डी० सं० 92/81	एल-12012/175/80 डी० 2 ए- 21-7-81	राज कुमार कलिया बनाम ऑरिएन्टल बैंक आफ कामर्स	
5. आई० डी० सं० 56/79	एल-17012/11/79 डी० 4(ए) 24-9-79	एम०आर०महला बनाम यूनाइटेड इन्डिया हॉस्पिटल क०	
6. आई० डी० सं० 114/81	एस-42012/10/81 एफ० सी० आई०/डी० 4-ए, 4-8-81	प्रेम चन्द बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया	
7. आई० डी० सं० 89/81	एल-42012 (II) /81 एफ० सी० आई०/डी० 4-ए	बर्ट लिंग बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया	
8. आई० डी० सं० 118/83	एल-42011/17/81 एफ० सी० आई०/डी० 4-ए	अमर सिंह और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया	
9. आई० डी० सं० 118/81	एल-42012/12/81 एफ० सी० आई०/डी० 4-ए	जिता सिंह और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया	
10. आई० डी० सं० 141/83	एल-17012/17/81 एफ० सी० आई०/डी० 4-ए, 2-6-82	परमजीत गिह बनाम यूनाइटेड हॉस्पिटल क०	
11. आई० डी० सं० 161/83	एल-42011/21/82 एफ० सी० आई०/डी० 4-ए, 28-1-82	महेंद्र कुमार और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया	

1	2	3	4
12.	आई० डी० सं० 151/83	एल-42012/29/81-एक०सी०आई०/डी०]4-ए०, 21-2-82	गुजरात मोटर्स लॉर अर्व बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
13.	आई० डी० सं० 159/83	एल-42012/22/81 एक०सी०आई०/डी० 4-ए०, 21-4-82	मिट्टू टी०१ शोर अर्व बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
14.	आई० डी० सं० 113/83	एल-42012/19/83 एक०सी०आई०/डी० 4-ए०, 8-10-82	अमरशंख सिंह बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
15.	आई० डी० सं० 139/83	एल-42012/18/81-एक०सी०आई०/डी० 4-ए०, 12-1-82	काका मिट्टू और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
16.	आई०डी०सं० 140/83	एल-42012/19/81 एक०सी०आई०/डी० 4-ए०, 25-1-82	सुखदेव मिट्टू और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
17.	आई०डी०सं० 145/83	एल-42012/8/82-एक०सी०आई०डी० 4-ए०, 28-6-82	बजीर चन्द और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
18.	आई०डी०सं० 143/83	एल-42012/9/82-एक०सी०आई०डी०-4-ए०, 28-6-82	नारायण सिंह और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
19.	आई०डी०सं० 70/79	एल-12012/14/79-डी०-3-ए० 18-12-79	के० पी० गाजरी बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ इन्डिया
20.	आई०डी०सं० 96/83	एल-12011/1/81-डी०-3-ए० 19-2-82	सिंह बनाम लक्ष्मी कारमणियल बैंक लि०
21.	आई०डी०सं० 162/83	एल-12012/20/82-डी०-3-ए० 6-11-82	अशोक कुमार बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला
22.	आई०डी०सं० 131/83	एल-12012/178/81-डी०-3-डी०-ए० 10-6-82	गुरुबीर सिंह बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला
23.	आई०डी०सं० 174/81	एल-12012/111/82-डी०-3-ए०, 1-12-81	प्रेम चन्द गुप्ता बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला
24.	आई०डी०सं० 122/83	एल-12012/247/81-डी०-2-ए० 10/16-6-82	पी० एल० मोहगिल बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला
25.	आई०डी०सं० 125/81	एल-12012/301/80-डी०-3-वी० 25-8-81	के० के० मिल्टल बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला
26.	आई०डी०सं० 148/83	एल-12012/121/81 डी० 2-ए० 10-5-82	मुमाय चन्द बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला
27.	आई०डी०सं० 120/83	एल-12012/277/81-डी० 2-ए० 10/16-6-82	बेवा सिंह बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला
28.	आई०डी०सं० 155/81	एल-42011/4/81-डी० 2-वी० 3-11-81	राम शाथ और अन्य बनाम भाष्टाडा बदास प्रबंध बोर्ड
29.	आई०डी०सं० 49/81	एल-42012/84/80-डी० 2-वी० 31-3-81	हरचरत शास बनाम बदास सततुज लिक प्रोजेक्ट
30.	आई०डी०सं० 55/78	एल-42012/56/77-डी० 2-वी० 15-6-82	विश्वनु राम बनाम बदास सततुज लिक प्रोजेक्ट
31.	आई० डी० सं० 31/80	एल-42012/41/79-डी०-5-डी० 2-5-1980	ओम प्रकाश बनाम बदास सततुज लिक प्रोजेक्ट
32.	आई० डी० सं० 58/81	एल-12025/15/80-डी० 3-वी० 27-4-81	वर्कमैन बनाम भाष्टाडा बदास प्रबंध बोर्ड
33.	आई० डी० सं० 6/80	एल-42011/14/78 डी०-2वी० 30-1-80	वर्कमैन बनाम भाष्टाडा बदास प्रबंध बोर्ड
34.	आई० डी० सं० 133/83	एल-12012/65/82-डी०-22ए०- 31-8-82	सी० के० अग्रबाल बनाम यूनियन बैंक आफ इन्डिया
35.	आई० डी० सं० 26/81	एल-42012/57/80-डी० 20वी० 21-2-81	सी० सेन बनाम भाष्टाडा बदास प्रबंध बोर्ड

1	2	3	4
36.	आई० डी० स० 128/83	एल-42012/42/83-डी० 2-वी 23-8-82	जुलकी राम बनाम भाष्वरा व्यास प्रबन्ध बोर्ड
37.	आई० डी० स० 156/81	एल-42011/10/81-डी० 2-वी० 9-11-81	निरजन सिंह और अन्य बनाम भाष्वरा व्यास प्रबन्ध बोर्ड
38.	आई०डी०स० 134/80	एल-42012/34/80-डी० 2-वी० 5-12-80	छंगा सिंह बनाम भाष्वरा व्यास प्रबन्ध बोर्ड
39.	आई० डी० स० 11/79	एल-12012/84/78-डी०-2-ए० 17-3-79	रामेश्वर लाल गुप्ता बनाम पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
40.	आई० डी०स० 137/81	पु/एल-33-3-(ए)	रामजी दास बनाम भाष्वरा व्यास प्रबन्ध बोर्ड
41.	आई० डी० स० 56/80	एल-42011/4/80-डी० 2-वी० 1-7-80	निकाला राम और अन्य बनाम भाष्वरा व्यास प्रबन्ध बोर्ड
42.	आई० डी० स० 108/81	एल-12012/79/81-डी० 2-ए० 1-8-81	जलिन्दर सिंह बीमा बनाम पंजाब एण्ड सिध बैंक
43.	आई० डी० स० 95/80	एल-42012/27/79-डी० 2-वी० 11-9-80	जार्दारा राम बनाम व्यास डिशाइन आर्ट्सजीशन
44.	आई०डी०स० 113/81	एल-12011/13/81-डी० 2-ए० 6-7-81	वर्कमैन बनाम पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
45.	आई० डी० स० 127/81	एल-12012/11/81-डी० 2-ए० 26-8-81	क० एस० ठाकुर बनाम बैंक आफ इंडिया
46.	आई०डी०स० 103/81	एल-12012/10/81-डी०-2-ए० 30-7-81	क० क० कौशल बनाम बैंक आफ इंडिया
47.	आई० डी० स० 147/83	एल-12012/248/81-डी० 2-ए० 29-3-1982	कपिल देव घर्यन बनाम पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
48.	आई० डी० स० 77/80	एल-12012/55/79/डी० 2-ए० 21-8-70	सूरजीत सिंह चड्डा बनाम पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
49.	आई० डी० स० 72/83	एल-12012/32/81-डी० 2-ए० 19-3-83	एम० आर० शिंदल बनाम पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
50.	आई० डी० स० 120/80	एल-42012/5/80-डी० 2-वी० 23-9-80	जी० एम० पुर्ण बनाम व्याप्र प्रोजेक्ट पावर विंग
51.	आई०डी०स० 34/81	एल-42012/41/80-डी० 2-वी० 18-3-81	मदन लाल बनाम बैंक कन्ट्रोलर बोर्ड
52.	आई० डी० स० 182/81	एल-12012/12/81-डी० 2-ए० 9-12-81	करनेत सिंह पंजाम बैंक आफ इंडिया
53.	आई००डी०स० 132/83	एल-42012/7/82-एफ०सी० आई०-डी० 4-ए० 27-8-82	रविन्द्र कुमार और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया
54.	आई० डी० स० 123/83	एल-13011/3/81-डी० 2-वी० 26-7-82	वर्कमैन बनाम केन्टोनमेन्ट बोर्ड
55.	आई० डी० स० 77/83	एल-13012/1/81-डी० 2-वी० 25-8-82	गुप्ताम मोहम्मद बनाम केन्टोनमेन्ट बोर्ड
56.	आई० डी० स० 116/83	एल-13011/4/81-डी० 2-वी० 25-11-83	वर्कमैन बनाम केन्टोनमेन्ट बोर्ड
57.	आई० डी० स० 57/80	एल-13012/2/79-डी० 2-वी० 1-7-80	देस राज बनाम केन्टोनमेन्ट बोर्ड
58.	आई० डी० स० 158/81	एल-13012/3/81-डी० 2-वी० 13-11-81	पान० क० आर० बनाम केन्टोनमेन्ट बोर्ड

1	2	3	4
69.	आई० डी० स० 86/80	एन-13012 / 6 / 77-डी० 2-वी 12-8-80	प्रेम सिंह भाट्टी बनाम केन्टोनमेंट बोर्ड
70.	आई० डी० स० 129 / 83	एन-13011 / 2 / 81-डी० 2-वी 25-8-82	वर्कमैन बनाम केन्टोनमेंट बोर्ड
71.	आई० डी० स० 126 / 81	एन-13011 / 1 / 81-डी० 2-वी 1-12-81	वर्कमैन बनाम केन्टोनमेंट बोर्ड
72.	आई० डी० स० 135 / 83	एन-13012 / 5 / 81-डी० 2-वी 11-1-82	दिमल चन्द्र शर्मा बनाम केन्टोनमेंट बोर्ड
73.	आई० डी० स० 25 / 81	एन-12012 / 8 / 80-डी० 2-वी 11-2-82	जात चन्द्र बनाम बैंक आफ बडोदा
74.	आई० डी० स० 23 / 81	एन-12012 / 15 / 79-डी० 2-ए 9-3-81	मुम्म दत्त बनाम न्यू बैंक आफ इन्डिया
75.	आई० डी० स० 92 / 80	एन-12012 / 176 / 79-डी० 2-ए 3-9-80	मणिक्र लिह बनाम पंजाब एण्ड सिध बैंक
76.	आई० डी० स० 12 / 79	एन-17012 / 13 / 78-डी० 4-ए 21-3-79	अमर सिंह बनाम नेशनल इन्डोरेन्स कॉ.
77.	आई० डी० स० 144 / 83	एन-12012 / 205 / 81-डी०-2-ए 29-3-82	अर्जीत सिंह बनाम पंजाब एण्ड सिध बैंक
78.	आई० डी० स० 168 / 83	एन-12012 / 20 / 82-डी० 2-ए 26-3-83	अशोक कुमार बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला
79.	आई० डी० स० 170 / 83	एन-12012 / 52 / 82-डी० 2-ए 17-3-83	कमलेण कुमारी बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ पटियाला
80.	आई० डी० स० 123 / 81	एन-42012 / 17 / 81-डी० 2-वी 19-8-81	गुरचरन सिंह बनाम भाष्टरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड
81.	आई० डी० स० 157 / 83	एन-42025 / 13 / 80-डी० 2-वी 22-5-82	वर्कमैन बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
82.	आई० डी० स० 131 / 83	एन-42012 / 11 / 82-डी० 4-ए 27-8-82	हरमेण कुमार और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
83.	आई० डी० स० 156 / 83	एन-42011 / 81-एफ० सी० आई०-डी० 4-ए 1-5-82	लाभ सिंह और अन्य बनाम फूयड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
84.	आई० डी० स० 74 / 83	एन-42011 / 17 / 81-एफ० सी० आई०-डी० 4-ए 18-2-82	रामपाल सिंह बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
85.	आई० डी० स० 71 / 83	एन-42012 / 25 / 81-डी० 4-ए 19-2-82	मतिक्यत सिंह और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
86.	आई० डी० स० 152 / 83	एन-42012 / 1 / 82 एफ० सी० आई०-डी० 4-ए 14-5-82	प्रवीप कुमार और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
87.	आई० डी० स० 158 / 83	एन-42012 / 5 / 82-एफ० सी० आई०-डी० 4-ए 11-5-82	रमजीत सिंह बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
88.	आई० डी० स० 160 / 83	एन-42012 / 28 / 81-डी० 4-ए 31-3-82	कालू राम और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
89.	आई० डी० स० 112 / 83	एन-42011 / 18 / 82-एफ० सी० आई०-डी० 4-ए 8-10-82	बक्सी राम और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
90.	आई० डी० स० 114 / 83	एन-42011 / 17 / 82-एफ० सी० आई०-डी० 4-ए 4-11-82	वर्कमैन बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया
91.	आई० डी० स० 147 / 83	एन-42012 / 361 / 81-एफ० सी० आई०-डी० 4-ए 15-3-82	जय देव कुमार और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया

1	2	3	4
82. आई० डी० सं० 157 / 81	प्रा०-42011/15 / 81-डी० 4ए 16-11-81	जगपाल मिहू और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया	
83. आई० डी० सं० 138 / 83	प्रा०-42012/ 20 / 81/एक० मी० आई०-डी० 4ए, 7-1-82	अजें मिहू और अन्य बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया	
84. आई० डी० सं० 150 / 83	प्रा०-42012/ 32 / 81-डी० 4ए 3-3-82	हस्त राज गुप्ता बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया	
85. आई० डी० सं० 11 / 80	प्रा०-12011/ 22 / 79-डी० 2ए 28-2-80	वर्कमैन बनाम मैन्युल बैंक आफ इन्डिया	
86. आई० डी० सं० 73 / 81	प्रा०-40012/ 1 / 80-डी० 2वी० 18-6-81	मोम राज बनाम मुपरिन्टेंडेंट आफ पोस्ट ऑफिस	
87. आई० डी० सं० 30 / 80	प्रा०-42011/ 31 / 78-डी० 2वी० 15-5-80	वर्कमैन बनाम भाबूरा व्याप्र प्रवंध बोर्ड	
88. आई० डी० सं० 154 / 83	प्रा०-42011/ 20 / 81-डी० 2 वी० 30-4-82	मेहर चन्द और अन्य बनाम भाबूरा व्याप्र प्रवंध बोर्ड	
89. आई० डी० सं० 31 / 81	प्रा०-42012/ 20 / 79-डी० 2वी० 11-3-81	हस्त राज बनाम व्यास सन्तुज लिक प्रोजेक्ट	
90. आई० डी० सं० 154 / 81	प्रा०- 42012/ 30 / 81-डी० 2वी० 20-11-81	जीम प्रकाश बनाम व्यास सन्तुज लिक प्रोजेक्ट	
91. आई० डी० सं० 124 / 81	प्रा०-42012/ 19 / 81-डी० 2वी०- 26-8-81	फूण्ड देव बनाम व्यास सन्तुज लिक प्रोजेक्ट	
92. आई० डी० सं० 66 / 81	प्रा०-42012/ 86 / 80-डी० 2वी० 27-5-81	जय राम बनाम व्यास सन्तुज लिक प्रोजेक्ट	
93. आई० डी० सं० 105 / 80	प्रा०-42011/ 10 / 77-डी० 2वी०- 24-9-80	वर्कमैन बनाम व्यास सन्तुज लिक प्रोजेक्ट	
94. आई० डी० सं० 153 / 83	प्रा०-12012/ 77 / 81-डी० 2ए 30-4-82	कूण्ड गौपाल गांधी बनाम संदूल बैंक आफ इन्डिया	
95. आई० डी० सं० 73/83	प्रा०-12012/ 83/1/80-डी० 2-ए 19-2-82	वी० क० भुज्यारी बनाम संदूल बैंक आफ इन्डिया	
96. आई० डी० सं० 89 / 78	प्रा०-13011/ 31 / 78/डी० 2ए 25/26-10-78	वर्कमैन बनाम संदूल बैंक आफ इन्डिया	
97. आई० डी० सं० 124 / 83	प्रा०-12012/ 307 / 81-डी० 2-ए 29-7-82	देव राज कोहली बनाम चार्टर्ड बैंक	
98. आई० डी० सं० 28 / 80	प्रा०-13012/ 2 / 78-डी० 2वी० 8-5-80	किरोरी मत बनाम कन्टोनमेंट बोर्ड	
99. आई० डी० सं० 33 / 81	प्रा०- 13012/ 6 / 80-डी० 2वी० 18-3-81	देव राज शर्मा बनाम कन्टोनमेंट बोर्ड	
100. आई० डी० सं० 159 / 81	प्रा०-14012/ 8 / 81-डी० 2वी० 13-11-81	गुलाम रसूल बनाम कन्टोनमेंट बोर्ड	
101. आई० डी० सं० 82 / 81	प्रा०-42011/ 36 / 80-डी० 2वी० 8-7-81	वर्कमैन बनाम व्यास डैम	
102. आई० डी० सं० 149 / 83	प्रा०- 42011/ 17 / 81-डी० 2वी० 9-3-82	वर्कमैन बनाम व्यास डैम प्रोजेक्ट	
103. आई० डी० सं० 160 / 81	प्रा०-12012/ 59 / 81-डी० 2ए 17-11-81	सुरिन्द्र प्रकाश बनाम संदूल बैंक आफ इन्डिया	
104. आई० डी० सं० 155-ए / 51	प्रा०- 12012/ 60 / 81-डी० 20 ए 13-11-81	मदन मोहन बनाम संदूल बैंक आफ इन्डिया	
105. आई० डी० सं० 115 / 81	प्रा०-12012/ 181 / 80-डी० 2-ए 10-8-81	क० ए० जैत बनाम संदूल बैंक आफ इन्डिया	
106. आई० डी० सं० 32 / 80	प्रा०- 42012 17 / 79-डी० 2-ए 23-4-80	गुरुचन्द्रन मिहू बनाम व्यास डैम प्रोजेक्ट	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
107.	आई० ई० सं० 126/८३	एल-12012 / 83/ 81-डी० २-ए	29-७-८२		द०० के० आनंद बनाम सैद्धान्त वैक आफ इंडिया	
108.	आई० ई० सं० 134/ ८३	एल-12012 / 101 / 81-डी० २-ए	30-१-८२		आर० मी० सनेजा बनाम सैद्धान्त वैक आफ इंडिया	
109.	आई० ई० सं० 50 / ७९	एल- 42012 / 13/ 79-डी० २-वी	6-९-७९		सचिविन्द्र मिह बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया	
110.	आई० ई० सं० 53 / ७९	एल-12012 / 12 / 79-डी० २-वी	6-९-७९		नरेण कुमार बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया	
111.	आई० ई० सं० 52 / ७९	एल-42012 / 11/ 79-डी० २-वी	6-९-८३		गलू कुमार शर्मा बनाम फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया	
112.	आई० ई० सं० 51 / ७९	एल 42011 / 11 / 78-डी० २-वी	6-९-८३		वर्मन बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
113.	आई० ई० सं० 57 / ७९	एल- 42012 / 7 / 79-डी० २-वी	15-१०-७९		अर्जि रसीद बनाम व्यास डेम प्रोजेक्ट	
114.	आई० ई० सं० 70/ ८१	एल- 42012 / 3 / 81-डी० २-वा	23-५-८१		सुर्जित कुमार बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
115.	आई० ई० सं० 111 / ८३	एल- 42011 / 2 / 82-डी० २-वी	17- ९-८१		दुर्गा दाम और अन्य बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
116.	आई० ई० सं० 74 / ८०	एल- 420 १ १ / 2५ / 79-डी० २-वी	24-७-८०		वर्मन बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
117.	आई० ई० सं० 119 / ८३	एल- 420 १ १ / १ / 82-डी० २-वी	11-12-८२		मूरम सिंह और अन्य बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
118.	आई० ई० सं० 115 / ८३	एल- 120 १ २ / २ / 82-डी० २-वी	9- 11-८२		जगिंद्रपाल बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
119.	आई० ई० सं० 117 / ८३	एल- 420 १ २ / ३ / 83-डी० २-वी	25- ११-८२		रत्नाल मिह बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
120.	आई० ई० सं० 127 / ८३	एल-4 20 १ २ / १ / 81-डी० २-वी	23-८-८२		वर्मन बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
121.	आई० ई० सं० ११/ ८१	एल- 420 १ २ / ११ / 81-डी० २-वी	9- ७-८१		प्रेदपाल मिह बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
122.	आई० ई० सं० १४/ ८१	एल- 420 १ २ / ३८ / 79-डी० ११-वी	25-३-८०		मजस्तान और अन्य बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
123.	आई० ई० सं० ३१ / ७९	एल- 120 १ १ / २ / 79-डी० ३-ए	15-३-७८		वर्मन बनाम प्रिण्डेज वैक	
124.	आई० ई० सं० १७६ / ७७	एल- 120 १ १ / १५ / 76-डी० २-ए	13-७-७६		श्रक्मैन बनाम प्रिण्डेज वैक	
125.	आई० ई० सं० ९८ / ७७	एल- 120 १ १ / १६ / 76-डी० २-ए	29-८-७५		धर्म मिह बनाम स्टेट वैक आफ इंडिया	
126.	आई० ई० सं० ६ / ७६	एल- 120 १ ३ / ३३ / 76-डी० २-ए	3-12-७६		जैगिंदर मिह बनाम स्टेट वैक आफ इंडिया	
127.	आई० ई० सं० १४३ / ८१	एल-42011 / ३ / 81-डी० २-वी	22-10-८१		तत्वा यम और अन्य बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
128.	आई० ई० सं० १४२ / ८१	एल-42012 / २५ / 81-डी० २-वी	22-10-८१		संदर्भ सिंह और अन्य बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
129.	आई० ई० सं० १३७ / ८३	एल-42012 / ३३ / 81-डी० २-वी	15- १-८२		अ.योध्या प्रसाद और अन्य बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
130.	आई० ई० सं० ६ / ८१	एल- 420 २५ / १४ / 80-डी० २-वी	8-१-८१		वर्मन बनाम भाष्मरा व्यास प्रबंध बोर्ड	
131.	आई० ई० सं० १३७ / ८३	एल- 120 १ २ / १७७ / 81-डी० २-ए	25- १-८२		हुग लाल बनाम स्टेट वैक आफ इंडिया	
132.	आई० ई० सं० १२४ / ८०	एल- 120 १ २ / १३३ / 78-डी० ५-ए	7-4-11-८०		मुभाष चड गुला बनाम स्टेट वैक आफ इंडिया	

1	2	3	4
133. आई.डी. नं. 112/81		पल-12012/28/80-डी.ए. 30-7-81	विधान सिंह बनाम स्टेट बैंक अफ इंडिया
134. आई.डी. नं. 24/79		यू/एम 33-2 (प.)	जॉ. गौ. वर्मी बनाम स्टेट बैंक अफ इंडिया
135. आई.डी. नं. 193/81		पल-12012/109/81-डी.ए. 19-1-81	मेध राम बनाम स्टेट बैंक अफ इंडिया

ए.वी.एस. शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी
[मं. पल-11025(2)/83-IV-B]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 8th June, 1983

S.O. 2936.—Whereas the industrial disputes specified in the Schedule hereto annexed are pending before Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi.

And Whereas a new Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court has been created at Chandigarh with jurisdiction over the States of Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Union Territory of Chandigarh;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers under section 33-B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby withdraws the proceedings in relation to the said disputes pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and transfers the same to Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Chandigarh, with the direction that the said Tribunal shall proceed with the proceedings from the stage at which they are transferred to it and dispose of the same according to law.

SCHEDULE

Sr. Reference I.D. No.	Number and date of the order of the No. before C.G.I.T.-cum- Labour Court New Delhi.	Govt. of India Ministry of Labour	Name of the parties
1	2	3	4
1. I.D. No. 107/80	L-12012/83/79-D.II. A-2-8-80		Ashwani Kumar Sharma Vs. Oriental Bank of Comm.
2. I.D.No. 75/83	L-12012/182/81-D.IIA—12-2-82		Ranjit Singh Vs. Oriental Bank of Commerce.
3. I.D. No. 106/81	L-12012/35/81-D.II-A—3-8-81		Amarjit Kaur Vs. Oriental Bank of Comm.
4. I.D.No. 92/81	L-12012/175/80-D.IIA 21-7-81		Raj Kumar Kalia Vs. Oriental Bank of Comm.
5. I.D. No. 56/79	L-17012(11)/79-D. IV(A) 24-9-79.		M.R. Narula Vs. United India Ins. Co.
6. I.D.No. 114/81	L-42012/10/81-FCI./D.IV-A 4-8-81		Prem Chand Vs. Food Corp. of India.
7. I.D.No. 89/81	L-42012(11)/81. F.C.I/D. IV.A		Beant Singh Vs. Food Corp. of India.
8. I.D.No. 118/83	L. 42011/17/81.FCI/D.IV.A		Amar Singh & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
9. I. D.No.118/81	L. 42012/12/81-FCI./D.IV.A		Jila Singh & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
10. I.D.No. 141/83	L. 17012/17/81-D.IV.A 2-6-82		Paramjit Singh Vs. United India Ins. Co.
11. I.D.No. 161/83	L. 42011/21/82. FCI/D. IV. A- 28-1-83		Mahesh Kumar & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
12. I.D.No. 151/83	L. 42012(29)/81.FCI. D.IV.A 11-3-82		Gulzar Mohd. & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
13. I.D. No. 159/83	L. 42012/22/81-FCI.D.IV.A 21-4-82		Mithu Singh & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.

1	2	3	4
14.	I.D.No. 113/83	L. 42012/19/82-FCI.D.IV.A 8-10-82	Amarjit Singh Vs. Food Corporation of India.
15.	I.D.No. 139/83	L. 42012/18/81-FCI.D.IV.A 12-1-82	Kaka Singh & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
16.	I.D.No. 140/83	L. 42012/19/81-FCI.D.IV.A. 25-1-82	Sukhdev Singh & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
17.	I.D.No. 145/83	L. 42012/8/82/FCI.D.IV.A. 28-6-82	Wazir Chand & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
18.	I.D.No. 143/83	L. 42012/9/82/FCI.D.IV.A. 28-6-82	Narain Singh & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
19.	I.D.No. 70/79	L. 12012/14/79.D.II.A 18-12-1979	K.P. Gajri Vs. State Bank of India.
20.	I.D.No. 96/83	L. 12011/53/81-D.II.A. 19-2-82	Trilok Singh Vs. Lakshmi Comm. Bank, Ltd.
21.	I.D.No. 162/83	L. 12012/20/82.D.II.A. 6-11-82	Ashok Kumar Vs. State Bank of Patiala
22.	I.D.No. 121/83	L. 12012/278/81.D.II.A 10-6-82	Soorvir Singh Vs. State Bank of Patiala
23.	I.D.No. 174/81	L. 12012/111/82.D.IV.A. 1-12-1981	Prem Chand Gupta Vs. State Bank of Patiala
24.	I.D.No. 122/83	L.12012/247/81.D.II.A. 10/16-6-82	P.L. Modgil Vs. State Bank of Patiala
25.	I.D.No. 125/83	L. 12012/301/80.D.II.A 25-8-81	K.K. Mittal Vs. State Bank of Patiala
26.	I.D.No. 148/83	L. 12012/121/81.D.II.A 10-5-82	Subhash Chand Bansal Vs. State Bank of Patiala.
27.	I.D.No. 120/83	L. 12012/277/81.D.II.A 10/16-6-82	Bawa Singh Vs. State Bank of Patiala.
28.	I.D.No. 155/81	L. 42011/4/81.D.II.B. 3-11-81	Ram Nath & Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
29.	I.D.No. 49/81	L. 42012(84)/80.D.II.B. 31-3-81	Harcharan Dass Vs. Beas Sutlej Link Project.
30.	I.D.No. 55/78	L. 42012/56/77.D.II.B. 15-6-78	Vishnu Ram Vs. Beas Sutlej Link Project.
31.	I.D.No. 31/80	L. 42012/41/79.D.II.B. 2-5-80	Om Parkash Vs. Beas Sutlej Link Project.
32.	I.D.No. 58/81	L. 42025/15/80-D.II.B. 27-4-81	Workmen Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
33.	I.D.No. 6/80	L.42011/14/78.D.II.B. 30-1-80	Workmen Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
34.	I.D.No. 133/83	L. 12012/65/82. D.II.A. 31-8-82	C.K. Aggarwal Vs. Union Bank of India.
35.	I.D.No. 26/81	L. 42012(57)/80-D.II.B. 21-2-81	Bhim Sain Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
36.	I.D.No. 128/83	L. 42012/42)/83.D.II.B 23-8-82	Julsi Ram Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
37.	I.D.No. 156/81	L. 42011/10/81.D.II.B. 9-11-81	Niranjan Singh Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
38.	I.D.No. 134/80	L.42012/3/80-D.II.B. 5-12-80	Chhanga Singh Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
39.	I.D.No. 11/79	L. 12012/84/78.D.II.A. 17-3-79	Rameshwar Lal Gupta Vs. Punjab National Bank.
40.	I.D.No. 137/81	U/s 33-2(A)	Ramji Dass Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.

1	2	3	4
41.	I.D.No. 56/80	L. 42011/4/80. D.II.B. 1-7-80	Nikka Ram & Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
42.	I.D.No. 108/81	L.12012/79/81-D.II.A 1-8-81	Jatinder Singh Cheema Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank.
43.	I.D.No. 95/80	L. 42012/(27)/79.D.II.B. 11-9-80	Jagdish Ram Vs. Beas Design Organisation.
44.	I.D.No. 113/81	L. 12011/13/81.D.II.A 6-7-81	Workmen Vs. Punjab National Bank
45.	I.D.No. 127/81	L. 12012/11/81-D.II.A. 26-8-81	K.S. Thakur Vs. Bank of India.
46.	I.D.No. 103/81	L. 12012/10/81.D.II.A. 30-7-81	K.K. Kaushal Vs. Bank of India
47.	I.D.No. 147/83	L. 12012/248/81-D.II.A. 29-3-1982	Kapil Dev Dhawan Vs. Punjab National Bank
48.	I.D.No. 77/80	L. 12012/55/79-D.II.A 21-8-78	Surjit Singh Chamha Vs. Punjab National Bank.
49.	I.D.No. 72/83	L. 12012/32/81.D.II.A.19-2-82	M.R. Singhal Vs. Punjab National Bank.
50.	I.D.No. 120/80	L. 42012/5/80-D.II.B. 23-9-80	G.S.Puri Vs. Beas Project Power Wing.
51.	I.D.No. 34/81	L. 42012/(41)/80-D.II.B. 18-3-81	Madan Lal Vs. Beas Construction Board.
52.	I.D.No. 182/81	L. 12012/12/81.D.II.A 9-12-81	Karnail Singh Vs. Bank of India.
53.	I.D.No. 132/83	L. 42012/7/82. FCI. DIV.A. 27-8-82	Ravinder Kumar & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. Of India.
54.	I.D.No. 123/83	L. 13011/3/81-D.II.B. 26-7-82	Workmen Vs. Cantonment Board.
55.	I.D.No. 77/83	L. 13012/1/81-D.II.B. 25-8-82	Gulam Mohd. Vs. Cantonment Board.
56.	I.D.No. 116/83	L. 13011/4/81.D.II.B. 25-11-82	Workmen Vs. Cantonment Board.
57.	I.D.No. 57/80	L. 13012/2/79-D.II.B. 1-7-80	Des Raj Vs. Cantonment Board.
58.	I.D.No. 158/81	L. 13012(3)/81.D.II.B. 13-11-81	N.K. Arya Vs. Cantonment Board.
59.	I.D.No. 86/80	L. 13012/6/77.D.II.B. 12-8-80	Prem Singh Bhatti Vs. Cantonment Board.
60.	I.D.No. 129/83	L. 13011/2/81-D.II.B. 25-8-82	Workmen Vs. Cantonment Board.
61.	I.D.No. 126/81	L. 13011/1/81. D.II.B. 1-12-81	Workmen Vs. Cantonment Board.
62.	I.D.No. 135/83	L. 13012(5)/81.D.II.B. 11-1-82	Bimal Chander Sharma Vs. Cantonment Board.
63.	I.D.No. 25/81	L. 12012/8/80.D.II.A. 11-2-82	Gian Chand Vs. Bank of Board.
64.	I.D.No. 23/81	L. 12012/15/79-D.II.A. 9-2-81	Shamboo Dutt Vs. New Bank of India.
65.	I.D.No. 92/80	L. 12012/176/79-D.II.A 3-9-80	Narinder Singh Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank.
66.	I.D.No. 12/79	L. 17012(13)/78-D.IV.A. 21-3-79	Amar Singh Vs. National Insurance Co.
67.	I.D.No. 144/83	L. 12012/205/81-D.II.A. 29-3-82	Ajeet Singh Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank.
68.	I.D.No. 168/83	L. 12012/20/82-D.II.A. 26-3-83	Ashok Kumar Vs. State Bank of Patiala.
69.	I.D.No. 170/83	L. 12012/52/82/D.II.A. 17-3-83	Kamlash Kumari Vs. State Bank of Patiala
70.	I.D.No. 123/81	L.42012/17/81-D. II.B. 19-8-81	Gurcharan Singh Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
71.	I.D.No. 157/83	L. 42025/13/80-D.II.B. 22-5-82	Workmen Vs. Food Corp. of India.
72.	I.D.No. 131/83	L. 42012/11/82.D. IV.A. 27-8-82	Harmesh Kumar & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
73.	I.D.No. 156/83	L. 42011/—/81.FCI. D. IV.A. 1-5-82	Labh Singh & Ors. Food Corp. of India.
74.	I.D.No. 74/83	L. 42011/17/81-FCI. D.IV. A. 18-2-82	Rampal Singh Vs. Food Corp. of India.
75.	I.D.No. 71/83	L. 42012/25/81-D.IV. A. 19-2-82	Malkiat Singh & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
76.	I.D.No. 152/83	L. 42012(1)/82.FCI.D.IV.A. 14-5-82	Pardeep Kumar & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
77.	I.D.No. 158/83	L. 42012/5/82. FCI.D.IV.A. 11-5-82	Ranjit Singh Vs. Food Corp. of India.
78.	I.D.No. 160/83	L. 42012/28/81.D.IV. A. 31-3-82	Kalu Ram & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.

1	2	3	4
79.	I.D.No. 112/83	L. 42011/18/82-FCI.D.IV.A. 8-10-82	Bakshi Ram & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
80.	I.D.No. 114/83	L. 42011/17/82. FCI.D.IV.A 4-11-82	Wormen Vs. Food Corp. of India.
81.	I.D.No. 147/83	L. 42012/361/81. FCI.D. IV.A 15-3-82	Jai Dev Kumar & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
82.	I.D.No. 157/81	L. 42011/15/81/D.IV.A. 16-11-81	Jagpal Singh & Ors. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
83.	I.D.No. 138/83	L. 42012/20/8/-FCI.D.IV.A. 7-1-82	Arjan Singh & Ots. Vs. Food Corp. of India.
84.	I.D.No. 150/83	L. 42012/32/81-D.IV.A. 3-3-82	Hans Raj Gupta Vs. Food Corp. of India.
85.	I.D.No. 11/80	L. 12011/22/79-D.II.A. 28-2-80	Workmen Vs. Central Bank of India.
86.	I.D.No. 73/81	L. 40012/1/80.D.II.B. 18-6-81	Som Raj Vs. Suptd. of Post Office.
87.	I.D.No. 30/80	L. 42011/31/78.D.II.B. 15-5-80	Workmen Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
88.	I.D.No. 154/83	L. 42011/20/81.D.II.B. 30-4-82	Mehar Chand & Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
89.	I.D.No. 31/81	L. 42012/20/79-D.II.B. 11-3-81	Hans Raj Vs. Beas Sutlej Link Project.
90.	I.D.No. 154/81	L. 42012/30/81. D.II.B. 20-11-81	Om Parkash Vs. Beas Sutlej Link Project.
91.	I.D.No. 124/81	L. 42012/19/81. D.II.B. 26-8-81	Krishna Dev Vs. Beas Sutlej Link Project.
92.	I.D.No. 66/81	L. 42012/86/80-D.II.B. 27-5-81	Jai Ram Vs. Beas Sutlej Link Project.
93.	I.D.No. 105/80	L. 42011/10/77.D.II.B. 24-9-80	Workmmen Vs. Beas Sutlej Link Porject.
94.	I.D.No. 153/80	L. 12012/77/81.D.II.A. 30-4-82	Krishna Gopal Gandhi Vs. Central Bank of India.
95.	I.D.No. 73/83	L. 12012/183/80.D.II.A. 19-2-82	B.K. Bhambari Vs. Central Bank of India.
96.	I.D.No. 89/78	L. 12011/31/78-D.II.A. 25/26-10-78	Workmen Vs. Central Bank of India.
97.	I.D.No. 124/83	L. 12012/307/81-D.II.A. 29-7-82	Dev. Raj Kohli Vs. Chartered Bank.
98.	I.D.No. 28/80	L. 13012/2/78-D.II.B. 8-5-80	Kirori Mal Vs. Cantonment Board.
99.	I.D.No. 33/91	L. 13012/6/80-D.II.B. 18-3-81	Des Raj Sharma Vs. Cantonment Board.
100.	I.D.No. 159/81	L.13012/8/-81-D.II.B. 13-11-81	Gulam Rasul Vs. Cantonment Board.
101.	I.D.No. 82/81	L. 42011/36/80-D.II.B. 8-7-81	Workmen Vs. Beas Dam.
102.	I.D.No. 149/83	L. 42011/17/81.D.II.B. 9-3-82	Workmen Vs. Beas Dam Project.
103.	I.D.No. 160/81	L. 12012/59/81-D.II.A. 17-11-81	Surinder Parkash Vs. Central Bank of India.
104.	I.D.No. 155-A-81	L. 12012/60/81.D.II.A. 13-11-81	Madan Mohan Vs. Central Bank of India.
105.	I.D.No. 115/81	L. 12012/181/80.D.II.A. 10-8-81	K.L.Jain Vs. Central Bank of India.
106.	I.D.No. 22/80	L. 42012/17/79-D.II.B. 23-4-80	Gurcharan Singh Vs. Beas Dam Project.
107.	I.D. No. 126/83	L. 12012/23/82-D.II.A. 29-7-82	V.K.Anand Vs. Central Bank of India.
108.	I.D.No. 134/83	L. 12012/104/81-D.II.A. 30-1-82	R.C. Taneja Vs. Central Bank of India.
109.	I.D.No. 50/79	L. 42012/13/79-D.II.B. 6-9-79	Sachwinder Singh Vs. Food Corporation of India.

110. I.D.No. 53/79	L. 42012/12/79-D.II.B. 6-9-79	Naresh Kumar Vs. Food Corporation of India.
111. I.D.No. 52/79	L. 42012/11/79-D.II.B. 6-9-83	Sant Kumar Sharma Vs. Food Corp. of India
112. I.D.No. 51/79	L. 42011/14/78-D.II.B. 6-9-83	Workmen Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
113. I.D.No. 57/79	L. 42012/7/79-D.II.B. 15-10-79	Aziz Masih Vs. Beas Dam Project.
114. I.D.No. 70/81	L. 42012/3/81-D.II.B. 23-5-81	Sushil Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
115. I.D.No. 111/83	L. 42011/2/82-D.II.B. 17-9-82	Durga Dass & Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
116. I.D.No. 74/80	L. 42011/25/79-D.II.B. 22-7-80	Workmen Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
117. I.D.No. 119/83	L. 42011/1/82-D.II.B. 11-12-82	Surat Singh & Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
118. I.D.No. 115/83	L. 42012/2/82-D.II.B. 9-11-82	Jeginderpal Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
119. I.D.No. 117/83	L. 42012/3/82-D.II.B. 25-11-82	Satpal Singh Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
120. I.D.No. 127/83	L. 42012/1/82-D.II.B. 23-8-82	Workmen Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
121. I.D.No. 91/81	L. 42012/11/81-D.II.B. 9-7-82	Pritpal Singh Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
122. I.D.No. 14/80	L. 42012/36/79-D.II.B. 25-3-80	Bhajan Lal & Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
123. I.D.No. 31/79	L. 12011/2/79-D.II.A. 16-3-78	Workmen Vs. Grindlays Bank
124. I.D.No. 176/77	L. 12011/15/76-D.II.A. 12-7-76	Workmen Vs. Grindlays Bank
125. I.D.No. 98/77	L. 12011/16/76-D.II.A. 29-8-75	Dharam Singh Vs. State Bank of India.
126. I.D.No. 6/76	L. 12012/33/76-D.II.A. 3-12-76	Joginder Singh Vs. State Bank of India.
127. I.D.No. 143/81	L. 42011/3/81-D.II.B. 22-10-81	Rulda Ram & Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
128. I.D.No. 142/81	L. 42012/25/81-D.II.B. 22-10-81	Sandharb Singh & Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
129. I.D.No. 137/83	L. 42012/33/81-D.II.B. 15-1-82	Ayodhya Pd. & Ors. Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
130. I.D.No. 6/81	L. 42025/14/80-D.II.B. 8-1-81	Workmen Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board.
131. I.D.No. 137/83	L. 12012/177/81-D.II.A. 25-1-82	Hira Lal Vs. State Bank of India.
132. I.D.No. 124/80	L. 12012/133/78-D.II.A. 14-11-80	Subhash Chander Gupta Vs. State Bank of India.
133. I.D.No. 112/81	L. 12012/28/80-D.II.A. 30-7-81	Dewan Singh Vs. State Bank of India.
134. I.D.No. 24/79	U/s 33-2(a)	J.G. Verma Vs. State Bank of India.
135. I.D.No. 193/81	L. 12012/109/81-D.II.A. 19-12-81	Megh Shyam Vs. State Bank of India.

■ वित्त मंत्रालय
(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)
(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 29 जून, 1983

का० आ० 2937—केन्द्रीय सरकार राजभाषा (संघ के शास्त्रीय प्रयोजन के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उन नियम (4) के अनुसरण में मंलम अनुबंध में सूचीबद्ध बैंकों के कार्यालय को, जिनके कर्मचारी बन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

बैंक राज मेहता, मंगुकत सचिव

[संख्या ई-11017/2/82-हिन्दी]

अनुबंध

बैंक आफ इंडिया

1. अंसरी रोड शाखा,
उ. अंसरी रोड,
दरियागांज,
नई दिल्ली -110002

2. जनकपुरी शाखा
स-1/135, जनकपुरी,
नई दिल्ली -110058

3. तिलकनगर शाखा
पम-3, अजय एन्सेले,
निलक नगर,
नई दिल्ली -110019

4. नरेला शाखा
उ. 11, कृष्ण निवास,
बबना रोड, नरेला,
दिल्ली - 110040

5. बांसखो शाखा
प्राम - डाकघर-बांसखो
तहसील-बस्सों,
जिला जयपुर,
राजस्थान -303305

6. तिगांव शाखा
प्राम घ डाकघर तिगांव,
तहसील बल्लभगढ़,
हरियाणा-121101

7. पानीपत शाखा,
जी० टी० रोड,
पानीपत, जिला करनाल,
हरियाणा-132103

8. सोनीपत शाखा
गीता भवन, सोनीपत,
हरियाणा-131001

9. गुडगांव शाखा ।
सवर बाजार, गुडगांव,
हरियाणा-122001

10. धर्मशाला शाखा
कोतवाली बाजार,
धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 29th June, 1983

S.O. 2937.—In pursuance of Sub rule 4 of 10 of the official Language (Use for official purpose of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the offices of the Banks listed in the attached Annexure, the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. F-11017/2/82/Hindi]

D. R. MEHTA, Lt. Secy.

ANNEXURE

BANK OF INDIA

- Ansari Road Branch.
3 Ansari Road,
Daryaganj,
New Delhi 110002
- Janakpuri Branch.
C-1/135, Janakpuri,
New Delhi-110058
- Tilak Nagar Branch.
S-3, Ajay Enclave,
Tilak Nagar,
New Delhi-110013
- Narela Branch,
2111, Kirpa Niwas,
Bawana Road, Narela,
Delhi-110040
- Banskho Branch,
Village & Post Office-Banskho
Tehsil-Bassi,
District Jaipur
Rajasthan-303305
- Tigaon Branch,
Village & Post Office-Tigaon
Tehsil—Ballabghar,
District Faridabad,
Haryana-121101
- Panipat Branch.
Grand Trunk Road,
Panipat, District Karnal,
Haryana-132103
- Sonepat Branch,
Gita Bhawan,
Sonepat,
Haryana-131001
- Gurgaon Branch,
Sadar Bazar, Gurgaon,
Haryana-122001
- Dharamsala Branch,
Kotwali Bazar,
Dharamsala,
District Kangra,
Himachal Pradesh

11. सिकंदरपुर शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर सिकंदरपुर,
जिला-फरुखाबाद,
उ० प्र०

12. हरसांव शाखा,
ग्राम हरसांव, डाकघर डासना,
जिला गाजियाबाद,
उ० प्र० - 201001

13. अर्जुनगंज शाखा,
दूतलानपुर रोड,
अर्जुनगंज, जिला लखनऊ
उ० प्र०

14. सलेमपुर शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर सलेमपुर,
जिला लखनऊ
उत्तर प्रदेश

15. मगरवारा शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर मगरवारा,
जिला उन्नाव,
उत्तर प्रदेश

16. धार शाखा,
राजवाडा, धार,
म० प्र० 454001

17. छिंदवाडा शाखा,
455/456, गोलगंज,
छिंदवाडा,
म० प्र०

18. सागर शाखा,
मकान नं० 90, गुजरात बाजार,
पौ० न०० स० 5, सागर,
म० प्र० 470002

19. सीहोर शाखा,
सीना भवन, सीहोर,
जिला सीहोर,
म० प्र० -466001

20. राजेन्द्रनगर शाखा,
२-सी अंकंकार, राजेन्द्रनगर,
जिला इंदौर,
म० प्र०-452012

21. सिमरिया शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर सिमरिया
जिला हजारीबाग,
बिहार

22. पंड रा शाखा,
डाकघर हैतल,
जिला रांची,
बिहार-834005

11. Sikanderpur Branch,
Village & Post Office-Sikanderpur,
District Farrukhabad,
U.P.

12. Harsaon Branch,
Village Harsaon,
P.O. Dasna, Ghaziabad,
District Ghaziabad,
U.P.-201001

13. Arjunganj Branch,
Sultanpur, Road,
Arjunganj,
District Lucknow,
U.P.

14. Salempur Branch,
At & Post Salempur,
District Lucknow,
U.P.

15. Magarwara Branch,
At & Post Magarwara,
District Unnao.
U.P.

16. Dhar Branch,
Rajwada, Dhar,
M.P. 454001

17. Chhindwara Branch,
455/456, Goleganj,
Chhindwara,
District Chhindwara,
M.P.

18. Sagar Branch,
House No. 90,
Gujarati Bazar,
Post Box No. 5, Sagar
M.P. 470002

19. Sehore Branch,
Sita Bhawan, Sehore,
District Sehore,
M.P. 466001

20. Rajendranagar Branch,
2-C. Alankar,
Rajendra Nagar,
District Indore,
M.P. 452012

21. Simaria Branch,
At & Post Simaria,
District Hazaribagh,
Bihar

22. Pandra Branch,
P.O. Hechal,
District Ranchi,
Bihar 834005

23. रातु शाखा,
प्राम व जाकधर रातु,
रातु चट्टी, जिला रांची,
बिहार

24. अरवल शाखा,
जाकधर अरवल,
जिला गया,
बिहार-804401

25. पिपलांवा शाखा,
पिपलांवा,
जाकधर नौबतपुर,
जिला पटना,
बिहार

26. जोहड़ी
सिडिकेट बैंक,
डाक-जोहड़ी-250345
बाघपथ-तहसील
बरोट ब्लाक,
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

27. टाकुर द्वारा,
रंजबाजार,
टाकुरद्वारा,
मुरादाबाद जिला,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

28. भोला,
सिडिकेट बैंक,
भोला,
मेरठ जिला,
मेरठ तहसील,
उत्तर प्रदेश

29. राया,
सिडिकेट बैंक,
राया,
मुरादनगर ब्लाक,
गाजियाबाद जिला,
उत्तर प्रदेश

30. बदनोरी,
सिडिकेट बैंक,
हायुड-मोर्दीनगर रोड,
बदनोरी,
मेरठ जिला,
उत्तर प्रदेश

31. दलपतपुर,
सिडिकेट बैंक,
इनफॉट मिल्क फूड फैक्ट्री के सामने
दलपतपुर,
आक-आका डिलारी,
मुरादाबाद जिला,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)
लाइ: कार्यालय : मुरादाबाद

32. सहपांड,
सहपांड-281407
मथुरा जिला,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

23. Ratu Branch,
At & Post Ratu,
Ratu Chhati,
District Ranchi, Bihar.

24. Arwal Branch,
P.O. Arwal,
District Gaya,
Bihar-804401

25. Piplawan Branch,
Piplawan,
P.O. Naubatpur,
District Patna,
Bihar.

सिडिकेट बैंक

SYNDICATE BANK

26. Johri,
Syndicate Bank,
P.O. Johri-250345
Baghpat-Tehsil, Barout Block,
Meerut Distt, U.P.

27. Thakurdwara,
Ganj Bazar,
Thakurdwara,
Moradabad District,
(Uttar Pradesh)

28. Bholi,
Syndicate Bank,
Bholi,
Meerut Dist.
Meerut Tehsil,
U.P.

29. Raya
Syndicate Bank,
Raya,
Muradnagar Block,
Ghaziabad District,
Uttar Pradesh

30. Badnoli
Syndicate Bank
Hapur Modinagar Road
Badnoli
Meerut Distt.
U.P.

31. Dalapatpur
Syndicate Bank
Opp Infant Milk Food Factory
Dalapatpur
P.O. Akka Dilari
Moradabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)
Tel-Office : Moradabad

32. Sahpau
Sahpau-281407
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

33. पिलाना
पिलाना,
बाघपत तहसील-250615
मेरठ जिला,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

34. शाहपुरकला,
सिंडिकेट बैंक,
बुन्देशहर,
जेवर रोड,
शाहपुर खुर्जा तहसील,
बुन्देशहर जिला

35. महलका,
सिंडिकेट बैंक
महलका,
सरधाना तहसील,
मेरठ जिला,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

36. जोया
जोया 244221,
अमरोहा तालुक
मुरादाबाद (उ० प्र०)
प्रोस्ट्रियट्स बैंक आफ कामर्स,
दिल्ली

37. दिच्छों कलां,
ग्राम और डाकघर- दिच्छों कलां,
ब्लाक नजफगढ़,
दिल्ली-110043.

38. मुर्निरका
डाकघर ज० एन० यूनीवासिटी,
नई दिल्ली-110067

39. पहलादपुर बांगड़,
ग्राम और डाकघर- पहलादपुर बांगड़,
ब्लाक अलीपुर,
दिल्ली-110042

40. खेड़ा कलां,
ग्राम और डाकघर खेड़ा कलां,
दिल्ली 110082

41. महीपालपुर
ग्राम और डाकघर खेड़ा कलां,
दिल्ली-110037

हिमाचल प्रदेश

42. लाहोरी मार्किट
लोअर बाजार,
शिमला,
हिमाचल प्रदेश-171001

43. मावीन
जिला हमीरपुर,
हिमाचल प्रदेश-177033

44. जुब्बर
जिला सोलन,
हिमाचल प्रदेश-173225

33. Pilana
Pilana
Baghpat Tehsil 250615
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

34 Shahpurkalan
Syndicate Bank,
Buland Shahr,
Jewar Road,
Shahpur Khurja Tehsil,
Buland Shahr Dist.

35 Mahalka
Syndicate Bank,
Mahalka
Sardhana Tehsil,
Meerut Dist,
U.P.

36 Joya
Joya 244221
Amroha Taluk
Moradabad (U.P.)

ORIENTAL BANK OF COMMERCE
DELHI

37 Dhichaon Kalan
V. & P.O. Dhichaon Kalan
Block Najafgarh
Delhi 110043

38 Munirka,
P.O. J.N. University,
New Delhi 110067

39 Pehladpur Bangar,
V. & P.O. Pehladpur Bangar,
Block Alipur,
Delhi 110042

40 Khera Kalan
V. & P.O. Khera Kalan
Delhi 110082

41 Mahipalpur,
V. & P.O. Mahipalpur,
Delhi-110037

HIMACHAL PRADESH

42 Lahori Market,
Lower Bazar,
Simla 171001

43 Nadaun,
Distt. Hamirpur,
Himachal Pradesh 177033

44 Jubbar,
Distt. Solan,
Himachal Pradesh 173225

45. पुराना बाजार
सुन्दर नगर,
जिला-मण्डी,
हिमाचल प्रदेश-174402

46. सोलन
श्री भावन,
हिमाचल प्रदेश-173212

हरियाणा

47. धनीरी
तहसील-नरवाना,
(जिला-जीद)
हरियाणा-126117

48. बीबीपुर
ग्राम एवं डाकघर- बीबीपुर,
जिला-जीद,
हरियाणा

49. धानरथ
ग्राम और डाकघर- धानरथ,
जिला-जीद,
हरियाणा

50. मुआना
ग्राम और डाकघर- मुआना,
जिला-जीद,
हरियाणा

उत्तर प्रदेश

51. देवकाली,
ग्राम और डाकघर-देवकाली,
तहसील-पैवाया,
जिला—शाहजहांपुर,
उत्तर प्रदेश-242402

52. जैतीपुर
ग्राम-जैतीपुर,
जिला-शाहजहांपुर,
उत्तर प्रदेश

53. नालाब टिकैत राय
योगेश्वर मठ मार्ग,
विहारी पुर, सखनऊ,
उत्तर प्रदेश-226004

53. स्टेशन रोड,
क अमेठी,
उत्तर प्रदेश

राजस्थान

54. बालसर मट्टा
जिला जोधपुर,
राजस्थान-342023

55. फतुहरी
जिला-श्रीगंगानगर,
राजस्थान-335901

45 Purana Bazar,
Sundar Nagar,
Distt. Mandi,
Himachal Pradesh 174402

46 Solan,
The Mall,
Himachal Pradesh-173212

HARYANA

47 Dhanauri,
Tehsil Narwana,
(Distt. Jind),
Haryana-126117

48 Bibipur,
V. & P.O. Bibipur,
Distt. Jind
Haryana

49 Dhatrath,
V. & P.O. Dhatrath,
Dist. Jind.
Haryana,

50 Muana,
V. & P.O. Muana,
Distt. Jind,
Haryana

UTTAR PRADESH

51 Deokali,
V. & P.O. Deokali,
Teh. Pawaya,
Distt. Shahjahanpur
Uttar Pradesh-242402

52 Jaitipur,
Village Jaitipur,
Distt. Shahjahanpur
Uttar Pradesh

53 Talab Tiket Rai,
Yogeshwar Math Marg,
Biharipur,
Distt. Lucknow
Uttar Pradesh-226004

53 Station Road,
A Amethi
Uttar Pradesh

RAJASTHAN

54 Balesar Saita,
Distt. Jodhpur,
Rajasthan-342023

55 Fatuhri,
Distt Sriganganagar,
Rajasthan 335901

56. खिचन
जिला-जोधपुर,
राजस्थान-342308

57. गांधी चौक
पुनामर,
जिला-चुहा,
राजस्थान-331402

मध्य प्रदेश

58. जोराखुद
मुरैनावरियर,
जिला- मुरैना,
मध्य प्रदेश

59. 1, सत्यपथ
नीमच,
मध्य प्रदेश-459441

60. 19, घास बाजार,
रत्नाम,
मध्य प्रदेश-457001

यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक दिल्ली मण्डल

61. यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक
सी-2 कम्मूनिटी सेटर,
जनक सिनेमा के समीप,
जनकपुरी,
नई दिल्ली-110058

62. यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक,
सी-1/1, कृष्ण नगर,
दिल्ली-110051

63. यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक
प्लॉट नं० 13 और 14
नई सब्जी मण्डी,
पी० ओ० आजादपुर,
दिल्ली-110033

64. यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक,
31/32, आसा राम रोड,
जी० टी० रोड,
शाहदरा,
दिल्ली-110032

65. यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक,
5100, जी० टी० रोड,
कलाक टाबर के समीप,
सब्जी मण्डी,
दिल्ली-110007
हरियाणा मण्डल

66. मूराइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक,
सदर बाजार,
अम्बाला कैण्ट-133001
(हरियाणा)

56. Khichan,
Distt. Jodhpur,
Rajasthan-342308

57. Gandhi Chowk,
Pulasar,
Distt. Churu,
Rajasthan-331402

MADHYA PRADESH

58. Jeora Khurd,
Morena Varier,
Distt. Morena,
Madhya Pradesh

59. Satyapath,
Neemuch,
Madhya Pradesh-458441

60. 19, Ghash Bazar,
Ratlam,
Madhya Pradesh-457001

UNITED COMMERCIAL BANK DELHI DIVISION

61. United Commercial Bank,
C-2, Community Centre,
Near Janak Cinema,
Janakpuri,
New Delhi-110058

62. United Commercial Bank,
C-1/1, Krishna Nagar,
Delhi-110051

63. United Commercial Bank,
Plot No. 13 & 14,
New Subzi Mandi,
P.O. Azadpur,
Delhi-110033

64. United Commercial Bank,
31/32, Asa Ram Road,
G.T. Road,
Shahdara,
Delhi-110032

65. United Commercial Bank,
5100, G.T. Road,
Near Clock Tower,
Sabzi Mandi,
Delhi-110007

HARYANA DIVISION

66. United Commercial Bank,
Sadar Bazar,
Ambala Cantt-133001
(Haryana)

67. यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक,
अ.र-8, एन एच-5,
फरीदाबाद-121001
(हरियाणा)

68. यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक,
मरम्बूलर रोड,
भिवानी-125021,
हरियाणा

69. यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक,
भिवानी स्टेंड,
रोहतक-124001
(हरियाणा)

70. यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक,
रेलवे रोड,
हिसार-125001
(हरियाणा)

यूनियन बैंक आफ इन्डिया
बच्चा प्रदीपा - 47

71. चाकघाट शाखा,
जिला : रीवा

72. चोरहटा शाखा,
जिला-रीवा

73. मोरवा शाखा,
जिला : सीधी

74. देबसर शाखा,
जिला : सीधी

75. बांसा शाखा,
जिला: बमोह

76. डाना शाखा,
जिला: सागर

77. हनुमना शाखा,
जिला : रीवा

78. गंगेव (रायपुर) शाखा,
जिला: रीवा

79. डगा शाखा,
जिला : सीधी

80. आमगांवबड़ा शाखा,
जिला : नरसिंहपुर

81. दमोह शाखा,
जिला : दमोह

82. डकाचया शाखा
जिला : इन्दौर

83. गुना शाखा,
जिला : गुना

84. रत्नगढ़खेंद्र शाखा,
जिला : रत्नपाल

85. कहानी शाखा,
जिला : सिवनी

67. United Commercial Bank,
R-8, NH-5,
Faridabad-121001
(Haryana)

68. United Commercial Bank,
Circular Road,
Bhiwani-125021
(Haryana)

69. United Commercial Bank,
Bhiwani Stanc,
Rohtak-124001
(Haryana)

70. United Commercial Bank,
Railway Road,
Hissar-125001
(Haryana)

UNION BANK OF INDIA
MADHYA PRADESH-47

71. Chak Ghat, Branch,
Distt. Rewa,

72. Chorhata Branch,
Distt. Rewa,

73. Morwa Branch,
Distt. Sidhi

74. Debsar Branch,
Distt. Sidhi

75. Bansa Branch,
Distt. Damoh

76. Dhana Branch,
Distt. Sagar

77. Hanumana Branch,
Distt. Rewa.

78. Gangev (Raipur) Branch,
Distt. Rewa.

79. Daga Branch,
Distt. Sidhi

80. Amgaon Bada Branch,
Distt. Narsinghpur.

81. Damohi Branch,
Distt. Damoh.

82. Dakachaya Branch,
Distt. Indore

83. Guna Branch,
Distt. Guna

84. Ratnagadh Kheda Branch,
Distt. Ratlam.

85. Kahanji Branch,
Distt. Siwani.

86. धमतरी शाखा,
जिला: रायपुर

87. जावा शाखा,
जिला: रीवा

88. समान शाखा,
जिला: रीवा

89. वैधान शाखा,
जिला: सीधी

90. दुधिचुआ शाखा,
जिला: सार्धी

91. नोहटा शाखा,
जिला: दमोह

92. छतरपुर शाखा,
जिला: छतरपुर

93. मढ़कोटा शाखा,
जिला: सागर

94. मउंज शाखा,
जिला: रीवा

95. शाहपुर शाखा,
जिला: सागर

96. मनिकवार शाखा,
जिला: रीवा

97. लोहारखरा शाखा,
जिला: देवास

98. एम० जी० रोड शाखा,
जिला: इन्दौर

99. टेमला शाखा,
जिला: पश्चिम निमार

100. रिठौरीकला शाखा
जिला: मुर्दा

101. फिंगेश्वर शाखा,
जिला: रायपुर

102. गंगेरखा शाखा,
जिला: सिवानी

103. रायपुर (कर्चुलिया) शाखा
जिला: रीवा

104. सोनरारी (रायपुर) शाखा,
जिला: रीवा

105. नगरी निवास शाखा,
जिला: सीधी

106. वडौरा शाखा,
जिला: सीधी

107. महाराजपुर शाखा
जिला: सागर

108. सिर्मोर शाखा
जिला: रीवा

86. Dhamtari Branch,
Distt. Raipur.

87. Jawa Branch,
Distt. Rewa.

88. Samon Branch,
Distt. Rewa.

89. Vaidhan Branch,
Distt. Sidhi.

90. Dudhi Chua Branch,
Distt. Sidhi.

91. Nauhata Branch,
Distt. Damoh.

92. Chhatarpur Branch,
Distt. Chhatarpur.

93. Gadhakota Branch,
Distt. Sagar.

94. Mau Ganj Branch,
Distt. Rewa.

95. Shahpur Branch.
Distt. Sagar.

96. Manikwar Branch.
Distt. Rewa.

97. Loharda Branch,
Distt. Dewas.

98. M.G. Road Branch,
Distt. Indore.

99. Temla Branch,
Distt. Nimar (West).

100. Rithauri Kalan Branch,
Distt. Muraina.

101. Fingeshwar Branch.
Distt. Raipur.

102. Gangerwa Branch,
Distt. Siwani.

103. Raipur (Karchulian) Branch,
Distt. Rewa.

104. Sonauri (Raipur) Branch,
Distt. Rewa.

105. Nagari Newas Branch,
Distt. Sidhi.

106. Vadhaura Branch,
Distt. Sidhi.

107. Maharajpur Branch,
Distt. Sagar.

108. Sirmaur Branch,
Distt. Rewa.

109. कोठी शाखा
जिला : सतना

110. जबलपुर शहर शाखा
जिला : जबलपुर

111. द्वारी शाखा
जिला : रीवा

112. सतना शाखा
जिला : सतना

113. पिपरई शाखा
जिला : गुना

114. निम्बोला शाखा
जिला : गुना

115. नागली शाखा
जिला : रतलाम

116. आवेगांव शाखा
जिला : सिवनी

117. सिवनी शाखा
जिला : सिवनी
राजस्थान-7

118. दर्रा शाखा
जिला : कोटा

119. गुनसारा शाखा
जिला : भरतपुर

120. खारवा शाखा
जिला : अजमेर

121. बांसवाड़ा शाखा
जिला : बांसवाड़ा

122. बासनी शाखा
जिला : जोधपुर

123. बदनोर शाखा
जिला : भीलवाड़ा

124. उम्मेदनगर शाखा
जिला : जोधपुर

उत्तर प्रदेश-271

125. अंचलीय कार्यालय
लखनऊ

126. अंचलीय कार्यालय
कानपुर

127. अंचलीय कार्यालय
वाराणसी

128. अंचलीय कार्यालय
मेरठ

129. अंचलीय कार्यालय
आजमगढ़

130. अंचलीय कार्यालय
गाजीपुर

131. अंचलीय कार्यालय
जौनपुर

132. अदलहट शाखा
जिला : मिर्जापुर

133. अहरौला शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

109. Kothi Branch,
Distt. Satna.

110. Jabalpur City Branch,
Distt. Jabalpur.

111. Dwari Branch,
Distt. Rewa.

112. Satna Branch,
Distt. Satna.

113. Piprai Branch,
Distt. Guna.

114. Nimbola Branch,
Distt. Guna.

115. Nagli Branch,
Distt. Ratlam.

116. Adegaon Branch,
Distt. Siwani.

117. Siwani Branch,
Distt. Siwani.
Rajasthan-7

118. Darrah Branch,
Distt. Kota.

119. Gunsara Branch,
Distt. Bharatpur.

120. Kharwa Branch,
Distt. Ajmer.

121. Banswada Branch,
Distt. Banswada.

122. Basani Branch,
Distt. Jodhpur.

123. Badnaur Branch,
Distt. Bheelwada.

124. Ummednagar Branch,
Distt. Jodhpur.

Uttar Pradesh-271

125. Zonal Office,
Lucknow.

126. Regional Office,
Kanpur.

127. Regional Office,
Varanasi.

128. Regional Office,
Meerut.

129. Regional Office,
Azamgarh.

130. Regional Office,
Gazipur.

131. Regional Office,
Jaunpur.

132. Adalht Branch,
Distt. Mirjapur.

133. Ahraula Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

134. इलाहाबाद-नैनी शाखा
जिला : इलाहाबाद

135. अमेठी शाखा
जिला : अमेठी

136. अतरोलिया शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

137. अबैरनी शाखा
जिला : भयुरा

138. बबुरी शाखा
जिला : बाराणसी

139. बहरौनी शाखा
जिला : सखनउ.

140. बांदा शाखा
जिला : बांदा

141. बाराचावर शाखा
जिला : गाजिपुर

142. बड़ीत शाखा
जिला : मेरठ

143. विजयलक्ष्मी मार्ग शाखा
जिला : बरेली

144. भरोही शाखा
जिला : बाराणसी

145. बीबीगंज शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

146. बोक्सी शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

147. कप्तानगंज शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

148. छम्मा शाखा
जिला : छिह्नी गढ़वाल

149. हस्पताल मार्ग शाखा
जिला : आगरा

150. इलाहाबाद (सुख्य) शाखा
जिला : इलाहाबाद

151. अलीगढ़ शाखा
जिला : अलीगढ़

152. असनगांव बाजार शाखा
जिला : बाराणसी

153. औराई शाखा
जिला : बाराणसी

154. आजमगढ़ शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

155. बढ़गांव शाखा
जिला : सहारनपुर

156. बजरंगनगर शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

157. बंधवा बाजार शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

158. बड़ागांव शाखा
जिला : बाराणसी

159. बरेली शाखा
जिला : बरेली

160. बेहट शाखा
जिला : सहारनपुर

161. भरतिया शाखा
जिला : मयुरा

134. Allahabad-Naini Branch,
Distt. Allahabad.

135. Amethi Branch,
Distt. Lucknow.

136. Atraulia Branch,
Distt. Azamgarh.

137. Avairani Branch,
Distt. Mathura.

138. Baburi Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

139. Bahrauli Branch,
Distt. Lucknow.

140. Banda Branch,
Distt. Banda.

141. Barachawar Branch,
Distt. Gajipur.

142. Badaut Branch,
Distt. Meerut.

143. Vijayalaxmi Branch,
Distt. Bareli.

144. Bhadohi Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

145. Bibiganj Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

146. Bozi Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

147. Kaptanganj Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

148. Chamma Branch,
Distt. Tihri Gadhawal.

149. Hospital Road Branch,
Distt. Agra.

150. Allahabad (Main) Branch,
Distt. Allahabad.

151. Aligarh Branch,
Distt. Aligarh.

152. Asangaon Bazar Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

153. Aurai Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

154. Ajamgarh Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

155. Badgaon Branch,
Distt. Saharanpur.

156. Bajranganagar Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

157. Bandhwa Bazar Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

158. Badagaon Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

159. Bareli Branch,
Distt. Bareli.

160. Behat Branch,
Distt. Saharanpur.

161. Bharatia Branch,
Distt. Mathura.

162. बिलरियांगज शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

163. बुद्धखेड़ा शाखा
जिला : महारातपुर

164. चहानियां शाखा
जिला : वाराणसी

165. चंदौली शाखा
जिला : वाराणसी

166. दयाल बाग शाखा
आगरा

167. इलाहाबाद-चौक शाखा
जिला : इलाहाबाद

168. जम्बारी शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

169. अनरत शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

170. ओरिहंर शाखा
जिला : गाजीपुर

171. सिविल लाईन्स शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

172. बहादुरगंज शाखा
जिला : गाजीपुर

173. बलिया शाखा
जिला : बलिया

174. बाराबंकी शाखा
बाराबंकी

175. बगायपार शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

176. बरेली छावनी शाखा
जिला : बरेली

177. बेलवा शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

178. भिम्बर शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

179. बिरली शाखा
जिला : गाजीपुर

180. बुद्नालस्या शाखा
जिला : तिहरी गढ़वाल

181. चिकिया शाखा
जिला : वाराणसी

182. चण्डेश्वर शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

183. चंदवक शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

184. डासना शाखा
जिला : मेरठ

185. देवकाली शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

186. धानापुर शाखा
जिला : वाराणसी

187. दुर्गांगज शाखा
जिला : लखनऊ

162. Bilriaganj Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

163. Budhkheda Branch,
Distt. Saharanpur.

164. Chahania Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

165. Chandauli Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

166. Dayalbagh Branch,
Distt. Agra.

167. Allahabad Chowk Branch,
Distt. Allahabad.

168. Ambari Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

169. Atrait Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

170. Aurihar Branch,
Distt. Gajipur.

171. Civil Lines Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

172. Bahadur Ganj Branch,
Distt. Gajipur.

173. Balia Branch,
Distt. Balia.

174. Bara Banki Branch,
Distt. Barabanki.

175. Baraipur Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

176. Bareilly Cantt. Branch,
Distt. Bareilly.

177. Belwa Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

178. Bhimbar Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

179. Birani Branch,
Distt. Gajipur.

180. Budnalasya Branch
Distt. Tihari Gadhwal

181. Chakia Branch
Distt. Varansi

182. Chandeswar Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh

183. Chandwak Branch
Distt. Jaunpur.

184. Dasana Branch,
Distt. Meerut.

185. Devkali Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

186. Dhanapur Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

187. Durga Ganj Branch,
Distt. Lucknow.

188. गहमर शाखा
जिला : गाजीपुर

189. घर्मपुर शाखा,
जिला : वाराणसी

190. गोरा बादणालपुर शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

191. ग्रामो प्रभू ग्रामो कालेज शाखा
जिला : गाजियाबाद

192. एम० मस्जिद चौक शाखा
गाजीपुर

193. गोपालपुर शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

194. शानपुर शाखा
जिला : वाराणसी

195. हंसराजपुर शाखा
जिला : गोजीपुर

196. हरिद्वार शाखा
जिला : सत्रारनपुर

197. हरानपुर कलां शाखा
जिला : मेरठ

198. जकिबनी शाखा
जिला : वाराणसी

199. जमालपुर शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

200. जांसी शाखा
जिला : जांसी

201. छम शाखा
जिला : टिहरी गढ़वाल

202. देहरादून शाखा
जिला : देहरादून

203. देवरिया शाखा
जिला : देवरिया

204. दानगंज शाखा
जिला : वाराणसी

205. धोरधरा शाखा
जिला : वाराणसी

206. फैजाबाद शाखा
जिला : फैजाबाद

207. गंगोली शाखा
जिला : कासीमाबाद

208. घनश्यामपुर शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

209. नयागंज शाखा
जिला : गाजियाबाद

210. घोसा शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

211. गोरखपुर (मुख्य) शाखा
जिला : गोरखपुर

212. हल्दौर शाखा
जिला : बिजनौर

213. हापुड़ शाखा
जिला : मेरठ

188. Gahmar Branch,
Distt. Gajipur.

189. Dharamapur Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

190. Gaura Badshapur Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

191. M.M.H. College Branch,
Distt. Gaziabad.

192. S. Masjid Chowk Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

193. Gopalpur Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

194. Gyanpur Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

195. Hansarajpur Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

196. Haridwar Branch,
Distt. Saharanpur.

197. Hasanpur Kalan Branch,
Distt. Meerut.

198. Jakkhini Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

199. Jamalpur Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

200. Jhansi Branch,
Distt. Jhansi.

201. Chham Branch,
Distt. Tihri Garhwal.

202. Dehradun Branch,
Distt. Dehradun.

203. Devaria Branch,
Distt. Devaria.

204. Danganj Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

205. Dhaurhara Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

206. Faijabad Branch,
Distt. Faijabad.

207. Gangoli Branch,
Distt. Kasimabad.

208. Ghanshyampur Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

209. Nayaganj Branch,
Distt. Gaziabad.

210. Ghosi Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

211. Gorakhpur (Main) Branch,
Distt. Gorakhpur.

212. Haldaur Branch,
Distt. Bijnaur.

213. Hapur Branch,
Distt. Meerut.

214. हरहुआ शाखा जिला : वाराणसी	214. Harhua Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
215. इटरी बाजार शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	215. Itauri Bazar Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
216. जलालाबाद शाखा जिला : गाजीपुर	216. Jalalabad Branch, Distt. Gazipur.
217. अर्द्धायुर शाखा जिला : गाजीपुर	217. Jangipur Branch, Distt. Gazipur.
218. जगांव शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	218. Kajgaon Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
219. चुटमलपुर शाखा जिला : महारनपुर	219. Chutmalpur Branch, Distt. Saharanpur.
220. देवबन्द शाखा जिला : महारनपुर	220. Devband Branch, Distt. Saharanpur.
221. देवांशरीक शाखा जिला : बाराबंकी	221. Devansharsi Branch, Distt. Barabanki.
222. धनियामऊ शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	222. Dhaniyamau Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
223. दोहरीघाट शाखा जिला : आजमगढ़	223. Dohari Ghat Branch, Distt. Ajamgarh.
224. फिरोजाबाद शाखा जिला : आयगर	224. Firozabad Branch, Distt. Agra.
225. गरवार शाखा जिला : बलिया	225. Garwar Branch, Distt. Balia.
226. गजियाबाद शाखा जिला : मेरठ	226. Gaziabad Branch, Distt. Meerut.
227. डिग्री कालेज शाखा जिला : गाजीपुर	227. Degree College Branch, Distt. Gazipur.
228. गोदख्लन शाखा जिला : मथुरा	228. Govardhan Branch, Distt. Mathura.
229. भादेबांज शाखा जिला : गोरखपुर	229. Sahebganj Branch, Distt. Gorakhpur.
230. हल्द्वानी शाखा जिला : नैनीताल	230. Haldwani Branch, Distt. Nainital.
231. हरदोई शाखा जिला : हरदोई	231. Hardoi Branch, Distt. Hardoi.
232. हरौला शाखा जिला : गाजियाबाद	232. Haraula Branch, Distt. Gaziabad.
233. जम्बनिया शाखा जिला : गाजीपुर	233. Jakhania Branch, Distt. Gazipur.
234. जलालपुर शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	234. Jalalpur Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
235. जौनपुर शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	235. Jaunpur Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
236. कैरोना शाखा जिला : वाराणसी	236. Kairona Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
237. बिरहाना गोड शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	237. Birhana Road Branch, Distt. Kanpur.
238. सर्वोदय नगर शाखा कानपुर	238. Sarvoday Nagar Branch, Distt. Kanpur.
239. करंडा शाखा जिला : गाजीपुर	239. Karanda Branch, Distt. Gazipur.

240. कासगंज शाखा
जिला : एटा

241. खेतसराय शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

242. कोयलस शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

243. लाहीदीह शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

244. पश्चाद शाखा
लखनऊ

245. आमीरगंज शाखा
लखनऊ

246. भद्रबहन शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

247. मलिकपुरा शाखा
जिला : गाजीपुर

248. मंसूरपुर शाखा
जिला : मुजफ्फरनगर

249. मार्टिनगंज शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

250. मथुरा शाखा
जिला : मथुरा

251. मेरठ (मूर्य) शाखा
मेरठ

252. मेहनगर शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

253. मोहम्मदाबाद शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

254. मुरादाबाद शाखा
मुरादाबाद

255. जनरलगंज शाखा
जिला : कानपुर

256. सीमामऊ शाखा
जिला : कानपुर

257. करहाशाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

258. कठिराव बाजार शाखा
जिला : वाराणसी

259. छुर्जा शाखा
जिला : बुलन्दशहर

260. कुरहा केशवपुर शाखा
जिला : फैजाबाद

261. मटोर (मंसूरी) शाखा
जिला : देहरादून

262. अमीनाबाद शाखा
लखनऊ

263. गचिवालय शाखा
लखनऊ

264. महाराजगंज शाखा
जिला : जौनपुर

265. मलपुरा शाखा
जिला : आगरा

266. मर्देह शाखा
जिला : गाजीपुर

267. मर्यादपुर शाखा
जिला : आजमगढ़

240. Kasganj Branch,
Distt. Eta.

241. Khetsarai Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

242. Koyalsa Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

243. Lahi Deeh Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

244. Aishbagh Branch,
Distt. Lucknow.

245. Daliganj Branch,
Distt. Lucknow.

246. Madhuban Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

247. Malikpura Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

248. Mansurpur Branch,
Distt. Muzaffar Nagar.

249. Martinganj Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

250. Mathura Branch,
Distt. Mathura.

251. Meerut (Main), Branch,
Distt. Meerut.

252. Mehnagar Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

253. Mohammadabad Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

254. Muradabad Branch,
Distt. Miradabad.

255. General Ganj Branch,
Distt. Kanpur.

256. Seesamau Branch,
Distt. Kanpur.

257. Kahra Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

258. Kathiraon Bazar Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

259. Khurja Branch,
Distt. Bulandshahar.

260. Kuhra Keshavpur Branch,
Distt. Faizabad.

261. Landaur (Masoori) Branch,
Distt. Dehradun.

262. Ammenabad Branch,
Distt. Lucknow.

263. Sachivalaya Branch,
Distt. Lucknow.

264. Maharaj ganj Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

265. Malpura Branch,
Distt. Agra.

266. Mardeli Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

267. Maryadpur Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

268. मूर्तनाथ भजन शास्त्रा
जिला : आजमगढ़

269. मेरठ छावनी शास्त्रा
मेरठ छावनी

270. मिर्जाबाद शास्त्रा
जिला : गाजीपुर

271. गोहना शास्त्रा
जिला : आजमगढ़

272. गोकुलदास रोड शास्त्रा
जिला : मुगाद्वारा

273. कल्याणपुर शास्त्रा
कानपुर

274. स्वरूपनगर शास्त्रा
जिला : कानपुर

275. रीमूर्दीनपुर शास्त्रा
जिला . गाजीपुर

276. केराकल शास्त्रा
जिला : जीनपुर

277. खुटहन शास्त्रा
जिला : जीनपुर

278. दालवंज शास्त्रा
जिला . आजमगढ़

279. श्रीगंतवंज शास्त्रा
खखनऊ

280. कराक्स अवध शास्त्रा
लखनऊ

281. पठलीशहर शास्त्रा
जिला: जीनपुर

282. मङ्गलवारा शास्त्रा
जिला : आजमगढ़

283. मानीकला शास्त्रा
जिला : जीनपुर

284. मडियाऊ शास्त्रा
जिला : जीनपुर

285. मसौरी शास्त्रा
जिला : बाराबंधा

286. मीरगांज शास्त्रा
जिला : जीनपुर

287. दिल्ली रोड शास्त्रा
जिला . मेरठ

288. मिर्जापुर शास्त्रा
मिर्जापुर

289. मोहम्मदपुर शास्त्रा
जिला : आजमगढ़

290. मुधारकपुर शास्त्रा
जिला : आजमगढ़

291. मुर्दिगंज शास्त्रा
जिला : जीनपुर

292. मुनी की रेती शास्त्रा
जिला : तिहरी गढ़वाल

293. नंदगंज शास्त्रा
जिला : गाजीपुर

268. Maunath Bhajan Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

269. Meerut Cantt. Branch,
Distt. Meerut Cantt.

270. Mirzabad Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

271. Gohana Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

272. Gokuldas Road Branch,
Distt. Muradabad.

273. Kalyanpur Branch,
Distt. Kanpur.

274. Swaroopnagar Branch,
Distt. Kanpur.

275. Karimuddinpur Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

276. Kerakat Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

277. Khutahan Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

278. Lalganj Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

279. Hajrat Ganj Branch,
Distt. Lucknow.

280. Clerks Avadh Branch,
Distt. Lucknow.

281. Machhali Shahar Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

282. Mazwara Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

283. Manikalan Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

284. Madiau Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

285. Masauli Branch,
Distt. Barabanki.

286. Meerganj Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

287. Delhi Road Branch,
Distt. Meerut.

288. Mirjapur Branch,
Distt. Mirjapur.

289. Mohammadpur Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

290. Mubarakpur Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

291. Muftiganj Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

292. Muni Ki Reti Branch,
Distt. Tihri Garhwal.

293. Nandganj Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

294. नौसद शाखा जिला : गोरखपुर	294. Nausad Branch, Distt. Gorakhpur.
295. पाली शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	295. Pali Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
296. पावाई शाखा जिला : आजमगढ़	296. Pawai Branch, Distt. Ajamgarh.
297. फूलपुर शाखा जिला : आजमगढ़	297. Phulpur Branch, Distt. Ajamgarh.
298. राजा बाजार शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	298. Raja Bazar Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
299. रामपुर शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	299. Rampur Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
300. रुषिकेश शाखा जिला : देहरादून	300. Rishikesh Branch, Distt. Dehradun.
301. रुद्रपुर शाखा जिला : गाजीपुर	301. Rudrapur Branch, Distt. Gazipur.
302. शहबांज शाखा जिला : बाराणसी	302. Shahabganj Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
303. साहसपुर शाखा जिला : देहरादून	303. Sahaspur Branch, Distt. Dehradun.
304. सैया शाखा जिला : गाजिग	304. Saiya Branch, Distt. Agra.
305. सरेधी शाखा जिला : आगरा	305. Saredhi Branch, Distt. Agra.
306. शादियाबाद शाखा जिला : गाजीपुर	306. Shadiyabad Branch, Distt. Gazipur.
307. शाहजहांपुर शाखा जिला : शाहजहांपुर	307. Shahjahanpur Branch, Distt. Shahjahanpur.
308. शक्तिनगर (कोटा) शाखा जिला : मिर्जापुर	308. Shaktinagar (Kota) Branch, Distt. Mirjapur.
309. मुगलसराय शाखा जिला : बाराणसी	309. Mogulsaray Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
310. मुजफ्फरनगर शाखा जिला : मुजफ्फरनगर	310. Muzaffar Nagar Branch, Distt. Muzaffarnagar.
311. नौपेड़वां शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	311. Naupedvan Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
312. नेवाडिया बाजार शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	312. Nevadia Bazar Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
313. पट्टी नरेन्द्रपुर शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	313. Patti Narendrapur Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
314. पवारा शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	314. Pavara Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
315. पुरेव शाखा जिला : जौनपुर	315. Purev Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
316. राजा तालाब शाखा जिला : बाराणसी	316. Raja Talab Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
317. रामपुर शाखा जिला : रामपुर	317. Rampur Branch, Distt. Rampur.
318. रुड़की शाखा जिला : सहारनपुर	318. Rurki Branch, Distt. Saharanpur.
319. सादात शाखा जिला : गाजीपुर	319. Sadat Branch, Distt. Gazipur.

320. महारनपुर (मुख्य) शाखा
जिला: महारनपुर

321. मैदपुर शाखा
जिला: गोपीपुर

322. मकार्डीहा शाखा
जिला: वाराणसी

323. मरमग शाखा
जिला: जौनपुर

324. जाहांज (मुख्य) शाखा
जिला: जौनपुर

325. शंभुगंज शाखा
जिला: जौनपुर

326. सिद्धनगर शाखा
जिला: गोपीपुर

327. मुंगरा बादशाहपुर
शाखा
जिला: जौनपुर

328. नकुद शाखा
जिला: महारनपुर

329. नराईबांध शाखा
जिला: आजमगढ़

330. नेवादा शाखा
जिला: वाराणसी

331. पड़ाव (जलीलपुर) शाखा
जिला: वाराणसी

332. फेफना शाखा
जिला: बिलिया

333. रायबरेली शाखा
रायबरेली

334. रामदयालगंज शाखा
जिला: जौनपुर

335. रेखलीपुर शाखा
जिला: गोपीपुर

336. रोटहा बाजार शाखा
जिला: वाराणसी

337. मगड़ी शाखा
जिला: आजमगढ़

338. कन्हैयालाल बलाथ
माकड़ शाखा
महारनपुर

339. सैयदराज शाखा
जिला: वाराणसी

340. सरायमीर शाखा
जिला: आजमगढ़

341. सरसेता शाखा
जिला: आजमगढ़

342. शाहगंज शुगर मिल कैम्पस
जिला: जौनपुर

343. शामली शाखा
जिला: मुजफ्फरनगर

320. Saharanpur (Main) Rly. Branch,
Distt. Saharanpur.

321. Saidpur Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

322. Sakaldiha Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

323. Sarsara Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

324. Shahganj (Main) Aliganj Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

325. Shambhuganj Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

326. Sidhnagar Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

327. Mungara Badshahpur Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

328. Nakud Branch,
Distt. Saharanpur.

329. Naraibandh Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

330. Nevada Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

331. Padav (Jalilpur) Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

332. Fefana Branch,
Distt. Balia.

333. Raibareilly Branch,
Raibareilly.

334. Ramdayalganj Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

335. Revatipur Branch,
Distt. Gazipur.

336. Rotaha Bazar Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

337. Segadi Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

338. Kanahaiyalal Cloth Market Br.
Distt. Saharanpur.

339. Saiyadraja Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

340. Saraimeer Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

341. Sarseta Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

342. Shahganj Sugar Mill Campus,
Distt. Jaunpur.

343. Shamli Branch,
Distt. Muzaffar Nagar.

344. मिकरारा बाजार शास्त्रा
जिला : जौनपुर

345. सिकरौर शास्त्रा
जिला : आजमगढ़

346. सिरकोनी शास्त्रा
जिला : जौनपुर

347. सीतापुर-नेत्र हस्पताल
शास्त्रा
जिला : सीतापुर

348. मुरियां शास्त्रा
जिला : वाराणसी

349. श्रानगदर्दी शास्त्रा
जिला : जौनपुर

350. त्रिलोचन महादेव शास्त्रा
जिला : जौनपुर

351. बाराणसी (सुक्ष्म) शास्त्रा
जिला : बाराणसी

352. चेतगंग शास्त्रा
जिला : बाराणसी

353. पैगम्बरपुर शास्त्रा
जिला : बाराणसी

354. राजस्थान शास्त्रा
जिला : बाराणसी

355. जफगांवाद शास्त्रा
जिला : जौनपुर

356. कुरुक्षेत्र शास्त्रा
जिला : मथुरा

357. कीरणपुरी शास्त्रा
जिला : कानपुर

358. परसरामपुर शास्त्रा
जिला : आजमगढ़

359. पत्तोही शास्त्रा
जिला : जौनपुर

360. अरसिया बाजार शास्त्रा
जिला : जौनपुर

361. सदुका बाजार
जिला : जौनपुर

362. मिधोरा बाजार शास्त्रा
जिला : बाराणसी

363. गिसोली शास्त्रा
जिला : मुजफ्फरनगर

364. सुजानगंग शास्त्रा
जिला : जौनपुर

365. चारी शास्त्रा
जिला : बाराणसी

366. टेकमा शास्त्रा
जिला : आजमगढ़

367. उजियार शास्त्रा
जिला : बनिया

368. बिशेश्वरगंग शास्त्रा
जिला : बाराणसी

344. Sikrara Bazar Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur

345. Sikraur Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

346. Sirkoni Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

347. Sitapur Eye Hospital Branch,
Distt. Sitapur.

348. Suriyanva Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

349. Thanagaddi Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

350. Trilochan Mahadev Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

351. Varanasi (Main) Branch,
Distt. Vraanasi.

352. Chetganj Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

353. Paigamberpur Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

354. Rajghat Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

355. Jafrabad Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

356. Kursunda Branch,
Distt. Mathura.

357. Kaushalpuri Branch,
Distt. Kanpur.

358. Parasrampur Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

359. Patrohi Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

360. Arsiya Bazar Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

361. Leduka Bazar,
Distt. Jaunpur.

362. Sindhora Bazar Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

363. Sisauhi Branch,
Distt. Muzaffar Nagar.

364. Sujanganj Branch,
Distt. Jaunpur.

365. Tari Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

366. Thekma Branch,
Distt. Ajamgarh.

367. Ujiyar Branch,
Distt. Balia.

368. Bisheshwar_ganj Branch,
Distt. Varanasi.

369.	कबीर चौरा शाखा जिला: वाराणसी।	369. Kabir Chaura Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
370.	पांडेपुर शाखा जिला: आराणसी	370. Pandeypur Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
371.	रथयात्रा शाखा जिला: वाराणसी	371. Rathyatra Crossing Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
372.	जमानिया (मुख्य) रेलवे स्टेशन शाखा जिला: गाजिपुर	372. Jamaniya (Main) Rly. Station Branch, Distt. Gazipur.
373.	हरौनी शाखा जिला: सख्नऊ	373. Harauni Branch, Distt. Lucknow.
374.	ओरंगाबाद शाखा जिला: वाराणसी	374. Aurangabad Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
375.	रेसीपुर शाखा जिला: आजमगढ़	375. Resipur Branch, Distt. Ajamgarh.
376.	सुखलालगंज शाखा जिला: जौनपुर	376. Sukhalalgunj Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
377.	तेजी बाजार जिला: जौनपुर	377. Teji Bazar, Distt. Jaunpur.
378.	जंधई शाखा जिला: जौनपुर	378. Janghai Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
379.	सिंगरामऊ शाखा जिला: वाराणसी	379. Singramau Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
380.	सीलापुर (मुख्य) शाखा जिला: सीलापुर	380. Sitapur (Main) Branch, Distt. Sitapur.
381.	सूरजनगर शाखा जिला: आजमगढ़	381. Surajpur Branch, Distt. Ajamgarh.
382.	टिहरी शाखा जिला: टिहरी गढ़वाल	382. Tihari Branch, Distt. Tihari Garhwar.
383.	उसिया शाखा जिला: गाजिपुर	383. Usiya Branch, Distt. Gajipur.
384.	काउंटरी शाखा जिला: वाराणसी	384. Cantonment Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
385.	लहरनारायण शाखा जिला: वाराणसी	385. Lahartara Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
386.	रेलवे स्टेशन शाखा जिला: वाराणसी	386. Railway Station Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
387.	मृत्तियार्ग शाखा जिला: वाराणसी	387. Sunarpura Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
388.	जमानिया—कस्बा शाखा जिला: गाजिपुर	388. Jamaniya-Kasba Branch, Distt. Gazipur.
389.	चांडगंज शाखा जिला: सख्नऊ	389. Chandganj Branch, Distt. Lucknow.
390.	टिकरी शाखा जिला: वाराणसी	390. Tikri Branch, Distt. Varanasi.
391.	काजरहाट शाखा जिला: मिर्जापुर	391. Kajarhat Branch, Distt. Mirzapur.
392.	छपरा मुम्बानपुर शाखा जिला: आजमगढ़	392. Chhapra Sultanpur Branch, Distt. Ajamgarh.
393.	गरियांवा शाखा जिला: जौनपुर	393. Gariyany Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
394.	मुस्ताफाबाद शाखा जिला: जौनपुर	394. Mustasabad Branch, Distt. Jaunpur.
395.	गंगोली शाखा जिला: गाजिपुर	395. Gangoli Branch, Distt. Gazipur.

BIHAR--8

396. शोधम शास्त्रा
जिला : खगड़िया

397. देवाबाद शास्त्रा
जिला : गिरिधीर

398. गोव शास्त्रा
जिला : गिरिधीर

399. दोरीदंज शास्त्रा
जिला : गारन

400. अड़की शास्त्रा
जिला : गौवी

401. समाझ शास्त्रा
जिला : गंगी

402. संदेश शास्त्रा
जिला : भोजपुर

403. केरदरी शास्त्रा
जिला : हजारीबाग

396. Chautham Branch,
Distt. Khagadiya.

397. Bengabad Branch,
Distt. Giridih.

398. Gandey Branch,
Distt. Giridih.

399. Doriganj Branch,
Distt. Saran.

400. Adki Branch,
Distt. Ranchi.

401. Tamar Branch,
Distt. Ranchi.

402. Sandesh Branch,
Distt. Bhojpur.

403. Keradari Branch,
Distt. Hazaribaug.

HARYANA--9

404. हासी शास्त्रा
जिला : हिसार

405. फतेहाबाद शास्त्रा
जिला : हिसार

406. खोरी शास्त्रा
जिला : महेन्द्रगढ़

407. कोमल शास्त्रा
जिला : कोमल

408. अंबाला छावनी शास्त्रा
जिला : अंबाला छावनी

409. कुलांडी शास्त्रा
जिला : हिसार

410. कुम्भेत्र शास्त्रा
जिला : कुम्भेत्र

411. सोनीपत शास्त्रा
जिला : सोनीपत

412. हिसार शास्त्रा
जिला : हिसार

404. Hansi Branch,
Distt. Hissar.

405. Fatchabad Branch,
Distt. Hissar.

406. Khori Branch,
Distt. Mahendragarh.

407. Kaithal Branch,
Distt. Kurukshetra.

408. Ambala Cantonment Branch,
Distt. Ambala Cantonment.

409. Kulan Branch,
Distt. Hissar.

410. Kurukshetra Branch,
Distt. Kurukshetra.

411. Sonipat Branch,
Distt. Sonipat.

412. Hissar Branch,
Distt. Hissar.

HIMACHAL PRADESH--8

413. मंडी शास्त्रा
जिला : मंडी

414. मेहतपुर शास्त्रा
जिला : उना

415. पानवा शाहिब शास्त्रा
जिला : पिरमुर

416. सोलन शास्त्रा
जिला : सोलन

417. निचार शास्त्रा
जिला : किन्नौर

418. कोटगढ़ शास्त्रा
जिला : शिमला

419. कांगड़ी शास्त्रा
जिला : कांगड़ा

420. शिमला शास्त्रा
जिला : शिमला

413. Mandi Branch.
Distt. Mandi.

414. Mehatpur Branch,
Distt. Una.

415. Panvata Sahib Branch,
Distt. Sirmur.

416. Solan Branch,
Distt. Solan.

417. Nichar Branch,
Distt. Kinnor.

418. Kotgarh Branch,
Distt. Simla.

419. Kangada Branch,
Distt. Kangada.

420. Simla Branch,
Distt. Simla.

बैंक आफ इंडिया
उत्तरी अंचल

421. अक्षनाथपुर शाखा,
कस्तुरबा रोड,
बज्जावरपुर,
दिल्ली-110036

422. अर्जुनपुर शाखा,
ग्राम अर्जुनपुर,
डाकघर-लोगारिया,
जिला कोटा, राजस्थान

423. सांगानेर शाखा,
गुलाब निवास, सांगानेर बाजार,
सांगानेर टाउन,
जिला जयपुर,
राजस्थान-303920

424. नाल शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर नाल,
जिला बीकानेर, राजस्थान

425. छोंकरवाड़ा शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर छोंकरवाड़ा,
तहसील बेहर, जिला भरतपुर,
राजस्थान-321407
उत्तर पश्चिमी अंचल

426. जीद शाखा,
अनाज मंडी, जीद, जिला जीद,
हरियाणा

427. भिवानी शाखा,
के० एम० कालोनी के पास,
बापोरा गेट, सर्कुलर रोड,
भिवानी, हरियाणा-125021

428. रोहतक शाखा,
762-763, सिविल रोड,
रोहतक,
हरियाणा-124001

429. राई शाखा,
जी० टी० रोड, राई,
जिला सोनीपत,
हरियाणा

430. चौधरीबास शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर चौधरीबास,
बरास्ता बारवा, जिला हिसार,
हरियाणा-125045
उत्तर प्रदेश अंचल

431. मकानपुर शाखा,
शकुंतला भवन,
ग्राम व डाकघर मकानपुर,
जिला मैनपुरी,
उत्तर प्रदेश-205145

432. मंधना शाखा,
जी० टी० रोड,
ग्राम व डाकघर मंधना,
जिला कानपुर नगर,
उत्तर प्रदेश

NORTHERN ZONE

421. Bakhtawarpur Branch,
Kasturba Road,
Bakhtawarpur,
Delhi-110036

422. Arjunpura Branch,
Village Arjunpura,
Post Sogaria,
Distt Kota,
Rajasthan.

423. Sanganer Branch,
Gulab Niwas, Sanganer Bazar,
Sanganer Town,
Dist. Jaipur,
Rajasthan-303902

424. Nall Branch,
Village & Post Office Nall,
Distt. Bikaner,
Rajasthan.

425. Chonkarwara Branch,
At & Post Chonkarwara,
Tehsil Weir, Distt. Bharatpur,
Rajasthan-321407

NORTH WESTERN ZONE

426. Jind Branch,
Anaj Mandi, Jind,
Distt. Jind,
Haryana

427. Bhiwani Branch,
Near K.M. Colony,
Bapara Gate, Circular Road,
Bhiwani, Haryana-125021

428. Rohtak Branch,
762-763, Civil Road,
Rohtak,
Haryana-124001

429. Rai Branch,
G.T. Road, Rai,
Distt Sonepat,
Haryana

430. Chaudhriwas Branch,
At & Post Chaudhriwas,
Via Barwa, Dist. Hissar,
Haryana-125045

UTTAR PRADESH ZONE

431. Makhanpur Branch,
Shakuntala Bhawan,
At & Post Makhanpur,
Distt. Mainpuri,
U.P.-205145

432. Mandhana Branch,
G.T. Road,
At & Post Office Mandhana,
Distt. Kanpur Nagar,
Uttar Pradesh

433. महाराजपुर शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर महाराजपुर,
जिला कानपुर नगर,
उत्तर प्रदेश

434. पाकवडा शाखा,
अस्ती नौबत राम,
ग्राम व डाकघर पाकवडा,
जिला मुरादाबाद,
उत्तर प्रदेश— 244102

435. भूरो शाखा, ग्राम व डाकघर
भूरो, जिला इलाहाबाद,
उत्तर प्रदेश
मध्य प्रदेश अंचल

436. घाटिया शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर घाटिया,
जिला उज्जैन, मध्य प्रदेश

437. बड़नगर शाखा,
महात्मा गांधी मार्ग, बड़नगर,
जिला उज्जैन, म० प्र०— 456771

438. बारोद शाखा,
बारोद, तहसील बड़वाह,
जिला पश्चिम निमाई,
मध्य प्रदेश

439. भोजपुरिया (पचोर) शाखा,
आगरा—बबई मार्ग,
ग्राम—भोजपुरिया, डाकघर पचोर,
जिला राजगढ़,
मध्य प्रदेश— 465683

440. खारकला शाखा, डाकघर खारकला,
तहसील हरसूद,
जिला पूर्व निमाई—म० प्र०— 450051
बिहार अंचल

441. अहिल्यापुर शाखा,
ग्राम व डाकघर अहिल्यापुर,
जिला गिरिधीह, बिहार

442. मसौरी शाखा,
स्टेशन रोड, मसौरी,
जिला—पटना,
बिहार- 804452

443. अटका शाखा, जी० टी० रोड,
ग्राम व डाकघर अकाट,
जिला—गिरिधीह, बिहार

444. चतरा शाखा, डाकघर चतरा,
जिला—हजारीबाग,
बिहार

445. रामगढ़ कैट शाखा,
शिवाजी रोड,
ग्रामगढ़ कैट,
जिला हजारीबाग,
बिहार

433. Maharajpur Branch,
At & Post Maharajpur,
Distt. Kanpur Nagar,
Uttar Pradesh

434. Pakwada Branch,
Basti Naubat Ram,
Village & Post Pakwada,
Distt. Muradabad,
U.P.—244102

435. Jhusi Branch,
At & Post Jhusi,
Distt. Allahabad,
Uttar Pradesh

MADHYA PRADESH ZONE

436. Ghatia Branch,
At & Post Ghatia,
Dist. Ujjain,
M.P.

437. Barnagar Branch,
M.G. Road, Barnagar,
Distt. Ujjain,
Madhya Pradesh-456771

438. Bagode Branch,
Bagode,
Thesil Barwaha,
Distt. West Nimar,
Madhya Pradesh

439. Bhojpuria (Pachore) Branch,
Agra-Bombay Road,
At Bhojpuria, Post Pachore,
Distt. Rajgarh,
Madhya Pradesh-465683

440. Khar Kalan Branch,
Post Khar Kalan,
Tehsil Harsud,
Distt. East Nimar,
Madhya Pradesh-450051

BIHAR ZONE

441. Ahilyapur Branch,
At & P.O. Ahilyapur,
Distt. Giridih,
Bihar.

442. Masauri Branch,
Station Road, Masauri,
Distt. Patna,
Bihar-804452.

443. Atka Branch, G.T. Road,
At & Post Atka,
Distt. Giridih,
Bihar

444. Chatra Branch,
Post Office Chatra,
Distt. Hazaribagh,
Bihar.

445. Ramgarh Cantt Branch,
Shivajee Road,
Ramgarh Cantt,
Distt. Hazaribagh,
Bihar

1. कैनरा बैंक
मंडल कार्यालय, कण्ठीगढ़ के अधीन अधिसूचित की जाने वाली शाखाओं के पते

446. कैनरा बैंक,
केवारसाथ बिल्डिंग,
निकल्सन रोड,
अम्बाला लालनी- 133001
(हरियाणा)

447. कैनरा बैंक,
जी० टी० रोड,
पानीपत
(हरियाणा)

448. कैनरा बैंक,
375 भगवान महावीर मार्ग,
झज्जर रोड, पो० बाक्स-58,
रोहतक- 124001
(हरियाणा)

449. कैनरा बैंक,
सरकुलर रोड,
नजदीक रोडी गेट,
पो० बाब०सं० 60,
सिरसा- 125055
(हरियाणा)

450. कैनरा बैंक
15/84, स्टेशन रोड,
अजमेर- 305001
(राजस्थान)

451. कैनरा बैंक,
पो० बाक्स-200,
होटल इम्पेरियल बिल्डिंग,
अरबिन्द मार्ग,
एम आई रोड,
जयपुर- 302001
(राजस्थान)

452. कैनरा बैंक,
पोस्ट बाक्स-125,
हिम्मत भवन,
बौपसानी मार्ग,
जोधपुर- 342001
(राजस्थान)

453. कैनरा बैंक,
7, सेठजी की बाड़ी,
मधुबन,
उदयपुर- 313001
(राजस्थान)

454. कैनरा बैंक,
दी बाल,
सोलन- 173212
(हिमाचल प्रदेश)

2. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक

455. थोकीय कार्यालय, कानपुर

456. अंचल कार्यालय, मेरठ

457. थोकीय कार्यालय, मेरठ

458. थोकीय कार्यालय, डेहरादून

CANARA BANK

Addresses of the Branches to be notified—
Chandigarh Division Office

446. Canara Bank,
Kedar Nath Building,
Nicholson Road,
Ambala Cantt-133001
(Haryana)

447. Canara Bank,
G.T. Road,
Panipat
(Haryana)

448. Canara Bank,
375, Bhagwan Mahavir Marg,
Jhajjar Road, Post Box. 58,
Rohtak-124001
(Haryana)

449. Canara Bank,
Circular Road,
Near Rodi Gate,
Post Box 60,
Sirsa-125055
(Haryana)

450. Canara Bank,
15/84, Station Road,
Ajmer-305001
(Rajasthan)

451. Canara Bank,
Post Box-200,
Hotel Imperial Building,
Arbind Marg,
M.I. Road,
Jaipur-302001
(Rajasthan)

452. Canara Bank,
Post Box-125,
Himmat Bhavan,
Chopsani Marg,
Jodhpur-342001
(Rajasthan)

453. Canara Bank,
7, Sethji ki Badi,
Madhuban,
Udaipur-313001
(Rajasthan)

454. Canara Bank,
The Mall,
Solan-173212
(Himachal Pradesh)

2. PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK

455. Regional Office, Kanpur

456. Zonal Office, Meerut

457. Regional Office, Meerut

458. Regional Office, Dehradun

459. श्रेत्रीय कार्यालय, पटना
 460. श्रेत्रीय कार्यालय, जबलपुर
 461. श्रेत्रीय कार्यालय, शिमला
 3. सिंडिकेट बैंक
 462. सिंडिकेट बैंक,
 आगरा, रघुनाथ नगर,
 महात्मागांधी मार्ग,
 डाक पेटी संख्या 108,
 आगरा-282002,
 (उत्तर प्रदेश)
 463. आगरा-छावनी
 इम्पीरियल सिनेमा कंपाउंड,
 सदर बाजार,
 छावनी, आगरा-282001
 (उत्तर प्रदेश)
 464. अलीगढ़-
 आगरा रोड,
 अलीगढ़-202001
 (उत्तर प्रदेश)
 465. अलीनगर,
 फिरोजाबाद तहसील,
 अलीनगर-283203
 (उत्तर प्रदेश)
 466. इस्लाहाबाद,
 पहली मंजिल,
 चंद्रशेखर आजाद मार्केट,
 सरदार पटेल मार्ग,
 सिविल लाइन्स डाक पेटी सं० 106,
 इस्लाहाबाद-211001
 (इस्लाहाबाद जिला)
 (उत्तर प्रदेश)
 467. अमरोह
 गोपाल बिल्डिंग,
 स्टेशन रोड,
 अमरोह-244221
 मुरादाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)
 468. असोडा, असोडा,
 हृष्ण तहसील
 गाजियाबाद जिला
 (उत्तर प्रदेश)
 469. बाचराऊं,
 बाचराऊं-244255,
 मुरादाबाद जिला,
 (उत्तर प्रदेश)
 470. बागपत,
 शिल्पी—सहारनपुर रोड
 बागपत-350609,
 मेरठ जिला,
 (उत्तर प्रदेश)

459. Regional Office, Patna
 460. Regional Office, Jabalpur
 461. Regional office, Simla
 3. SYNDICATE BANK
 462. Syndicate Bank,
 Agra, Raghunath Nagar,
 Mahatma Gandhi Marg,
 Post Box No. 108,
 Agra-282002
 Uttar Pradesh,
 463. Agra-Cantonment,
 Imperial Cinema Compound,
 Sadar Bazar,
 Cantonment,
 Agra-282001
 (Uttar Pradesh)
 464. Aligarh,
 Agra Road,
 Aligarh-202001
 (Uttar Pradesh)
 465. Alinagar,
 Firozabad Tehsil,
 Alinagar-283203
 (Uttar Pradesh)
 466. Allahabad,
 1st Floor,
 Chandrashekhar Azad Market,
 Sardar Patel Marg,
 Civil Line, P.B. No. 106,
 Allahabad-211001
 Allahabad District,
 (Uttar Pradesh)
 467. Amroha,
 Gopal Building,
 Station Road,
 Amroha-244221
 Muradabad District
 (Uttar Pradesh)
 468. Asoda,
 Asoda,
 Hapur Tehsil,
 Ghaziabad District
 (Uttar Pradesh)
 469. Bacharaun,
 Bacharaun-244255
 Muradabad District
 (Uttar Pradesh)
 470. Baghpat
 Delhi-Saharanpur Road,
 Bhagpat-250609,
 Meerut District
 (Uttar Pradesh)

471. अहजोई स्टेशन रोड,
बहजोई—202410
मुरादाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

472. बाजना
बाजना—281201
मठ नहसील मथुरा जिला,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

473. बलदेव,
निवारी रोड,
बलदेव-281301 सदाबाद तहसील
मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

474. बाजली
रघुवीर भवन,
बाउली-बड़ौत ब्लॉक, बागपत
तहसील मेरठ जिला उ० प्र०

475. बरारा
बरारा-282001
आगरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

476. बराउत
भगवान महावीर मार्ग,
आनंद गंज बंडी के सामने,
बाकपेटी संख्या-13,
बड़ौत-250611
बागपत तालुका
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

477. बहसुमा
पुलिस स्टेशन मैन रोड के नजदीक,
बहसुमा-250404
मवाना तहसील, मेरठ जिला,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

478. भटीपुरा
भटीपुरा-250001
मवाना तहसील
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

479. भटोना
भटोना-245408
गुलोती ब्लॉक
बुलंदशहर तहसील,
बुलंदशहर जिला,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

471. Bahjoi,
Station Road,
Bahjoi-202410
Muradabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

472. Bajna,
Bajna-281201
Math Tehsil, Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

473. Baldev,
Niwari Road,
Baldev-281301
Sadabad Tehsil
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

474. Bawli
Raghuvir Bhavan
Bawli-Baraut Block
Baghpat Tehsil, Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

475. Barara
Barara-282001
Agra District
(Uttar Pradesh)

476. Baraut
Bhagwan Mahaveer Marg,
Opp. Anand ganj Mandi,
P. B. No. 13, Baraut-250611
Baghpat Taluk,
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

477. Bahsuma
Near Police Station Main Road,
Bahsuma-250404
Mawana Tehsil
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

478. Bhatipura
Bhatipura-250001
Mawana Tehsil
Meerut District,
(Uttar Pradesh)

479. Bhatona
Bhatona-245408
Galaothi Block
Bulandshahar Tehsil
Bulandshahar District
(Uttar Pradesh)

480. भोजपुर,
मुरादाबाद जिला-8590
भोजपुर-244402
पिपल सना (आर. एस.)
मुरादाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

481. बिसाहडा
बिसाहडा—203207
शिश मंडल के सामने
गाजियाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

482. बिसावर
बिसावर-281302
सदाबाद तहसील
मथुरा जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

483. बिसरख
बिसरख ब्लॉक,
दावरी तहसील
गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

484. बोखरारी
बोखरारी-281403
छाता तहसील
मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

485. चंदौसी
रामस्वरूप रोड
चंदौसी-202412
बिलारी तहसील,
मुरादाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

486. छाता
एल.एस.एस. बिल्डिंग,
विल्ली-आगरा रोड,
छाता-281401
मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

487. छोलस
छोलस-203207
दादरी तहसील
गाजियाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

488. चोमा
चोमा-281001
छाता तालुका
मथुरा जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

489. देहरा
देहरा-201001
झापुड़ तहसील, गाजियाबाद मार्ग,
मे, गाजियाबाद जिला,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

480. Bhojapur
Muradabad-District-8590
Bhojapur-244402
Pipal Sana(RS.)
Muradabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

481. Bishara
Dishara-203207
Opp-Shisha Manqal,
Ghaziabad District,
(Uttar Pradesh)

482. Bisawar
Bisawar-281302
Sadabad Tehsil
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

483. Bisrakh,
Bisrakh Block
Dadri Tehsil
Ghaziabad District.
(Uttar Pradesh)

484. Bokhrari
Bokhrari-281403
Chhata Tehsil
Mathura District,
(Uttar Pradesh)

485. Chandausi
Ramswarup Road
Chandausi-202412
Bilari Teshil, Moradabad District,
(Uttar Pradesh)

486. Chhata
L.S.S. Building
Delhi-Agra Road,
Chhata-281401,
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

487. Chholas
Chholas-203207
Dadri Tehsil
Ghaziabad District,
(Uttar Pradesh)

488. Choma
Choma-281001
Chhata Taluk, Mathura District,
(Uttar Pradesh)

489. Dchra
Dehra-201001
Papur Tehsil via Ghaziabad
Ghaziabad District,
(Uttar Pradesh)

490.	45, रायपुर रोड, डाकघर सं० ३० देहरादून-२४८००१ (उत्तर प्रदेश)	490. 45, Raypur Road, P.B. No. 30, Dehradun-248001 (Uttar Pradesh)
491.	धौलाना धौलाना- २४५३०१ हापूर तहसील गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	491. Dhaulana Dhaulana 245301 Hapur Tehsil Ghaziabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
492.	दोघट दोघट- २५०६२२ मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	492. Doghat Doghat 250622 Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
493.	डोला पिलाना ब्लॉक बाग्हपत तहसील डोला- २५०६०९ मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	493. Dola Pilana Block Baghapat Tensil Dola 250609, Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
494.	दौताई दौताई- २४५२०५ गढमुक्तेश्वर ब्लॉक (तहसील) गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	494. Dutai Dutai 245205 Garhmukteshwar Block (Tehsil) Ghaziabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
495.	फराह फराह २८११२२ मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	495. Farah Farah 281122 Mathura District (Uttar Pradesh)
496.	फरीदनगर फरीदनगर- २४४६०१ हापूर तहसील गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	496. Faridnagar Faridnagar 244601 Hapur Tehsil Ghaziabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
497.	फारुखनगर (उत्तर प्रदेश) लोरी ब्लॉक फारुखनगर गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	497. Farukhnagar (Uttar Pradesh) Loni Block Farukhnagar Ghaziabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
498.	गजरौला रेलवे स्टेशन के सामने हासनपुर तहसील मुरादाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	498. Gajraula Opp. Railway Station Hassanpur Tehsil Moradabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
499.	गढमुक्तेश्वर मंडी जवाहर गंज गढमुक्तेश्वर- २४५२०५ हापूर तहसील, गाजियाबाद जिला, (उत्तर प्रदेश)	499. Garhmukteshwar Mandi Jawaharganj Garhmukteshwar Hapur Tehsil, Ghaziabad District, (Uttar Pradesh)

500 धनौरा
धनौरा- 244231
हासनपुर तालुका,
मुरादाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

501 गाजियाबाद
नवयुग मार्केट,
66, नवयुग मार्केट,
डाकघरी सं. 63,
गाजियाबाद- 201001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)

502 हापुड़
कोठी गेट, डाकघरी सं. 4,
हापुड़- 245101
गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

503 हारिद्वार
194, साधु बेला मार्ग,
हारिद्वार- 249401
महारनपुर जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

504 हासनपुर
मोहल्ला होस्तीवाला,
हासनपुर- 244241 (उत्तर प्रदेश)

505 ईकड़ी
ईकड़ी
सरधाना तहसील
मेरठ जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

506 जलालाबाद
जलालाबाद
गाजियाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

507. जार्चा 8766
जार्चा 203205, दादरी ब्लॉक
गाजियाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

508. झरोठा 8851
मथुरा जिला
झरोठा- 281301
बलदेव ड्यूक (उत्तर प्रदेश)

509. कादराबाद
धमपुर कादराबाद रोड,
बिजनौर जिला
कादराबाद- 246751
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

510. कामर
मथुरा जिला
कामर- 281403
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

500. Dhanaura
Dhanaura-244231
Hasanpur Taluk, Moradabad
District, (Uttar Pradesh)

501. Ghaziabad
Navyug Market,
66, Navyug Market, P.B. No. 63.
Ghaziabad-201001
(Uttar Pradesh)

502. Hapur
Kothi Gate, P.B. No. 4
Hapur-245101
Ghaziabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

503. Haridwar.
194, Sadhu Bela Marg,
Hardwar-249401
Saharanpur District
(Uttar Pradesh)

504. Hasanpur.
Mohalla Heliwala,
Hasanpur-244241
(Uttar Pradesh)

505. Ikri
Ikri
Sardhana Tehsil
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

506. Jalalabad
Jalalabad
Ghaziabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

507. Jarcha 8766
Jarcha 203205
Dadri Block
Ghaziabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

508. Jharotha 8851
Mathura District
Jharotha-281301
Baldeo Block
(Uttar Pradesh)

509. Kadrabad
Dhampur Kadrabad Road,
Bijnor District
Kadrabad-246751
(Uttar Pradesh)

510. Kamar
Mathura District
Kamar-281403
(Uttar Pradesh)

511. काठ	511. Kanth Ist Floor Kanth Vaishya Sabha Building, Main Market, Kanth-244501 Amroha Tehsil, Moradabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
512. कनकहा	512. Kankaha Lucknow-Rai Bareli Road Kankaha, Lucknow District (Uttar Pradesh)
513. कानपुर	513. Kanpur B 1/B Officers Colony Sarvodaya Nagar, Kanpur-208001.
514. खैरा	514. Khaira, Maharashtra Patalganga Industrial Area, MIDC Water Industrial Area Khaira-410207, Khalapur Taluk, Raigad District, (Maharashtra State).
515. करखोदा	515. Kharkhauda Main Road, Karkhauda-245206 Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
516. ख्वाज नंगल	516. Khwaja Nangal Khwaja Nanga-250161 Chhaprauli Block Baghapat Teshil Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
517. खेकडा	517. Khekara Jain College Road, Khekhara, Baghapat Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
518. कोसी कलां	518. Kosikalan Rajbhawan, 1st Floor, P.B. No. 1. Kosikalan-281403 Chhata Tehsil, Mathura District (Uttar Pradesh)
519. लखनऊ	519. Lunckow, Aminabad Gulmarg Hotel (Opp.) Aminabad, Lucknow-226018 (Uttar Pradesh)
520. किशनपुर बराल	520. Kishanpur Baral Kishanpur Baral-250623 Baraut Block, Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)

521. मिंडिकेट हैंक
मालीबाडा
गाजियाबाद
गाजियाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

522. मामनखुर्द
श्रीष्टीन रोड,
मामनखुर्द-203001
बुलंदशहर जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

523. मानागढी
मानागढी-281201
मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

524. मथुरा (मैन), शांति मार्केट
शांति मार्केट, होली गेट
मथुरा-281001,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

525. मथुरा,
चौक, बोरी बाजार,
चौक, मथुरा-281001
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

526. ममूरी
ममूरी
डाकघर दासना
गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

527. मोराना
धामपुर रोड
मोराना-246761
बिजलीर जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

528. मेरठ (मैन)
सिटीईव सिनेमा के नजदीक,
65, शिवपुरी
मेरठ शहर-250001
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

529. मेरठ
साकेत
201, मार्केट
मेरठ-250001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)

530. मेरठ
कैटोनमेंट
बड़ीलाल ब्लॉक लिमिटेड
कैटोनमेंट
मेरठ-250001
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

531. मेरठ
डिफेन्स कालोनी,
डिफेन्स कालोनी,
मावाना रोड, कैटोनमेंट
मेरठ-250001
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

521. Syndicate Bank
Maliwara
Ghaziabad
Ghaziabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

522. Mamankhurd
G.T. Road,
Mamankhurd-203001
Bulandshahar District
(Uttar Pradesh)

523. Managari
Managari-281201,
Mathura District (Uttar Pradesh)

524. Mathura (Main), Shanti Market,
Shanti Market
Holi Gate
Mathura-281001 (Uttar Pradesh)

525. Mathura
Chowk, Dori Bazar,
Chowk, Mathura -281001
(Uttar Pradesh)

526. Masoori
Masoori
D.O. Dasana
Ghaziabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

527. Morana
Dhampur Road
Morana-246761
Bijnor District
(Uttar Pradesh)

528. Meerut (Main)
City EVES CINEMA, Near
65, Shivpuri
Meerut City-250001
(Uttar Pradesh)

529. Meerut
Saket
201, Saket,
Meerut-250001
(Uttar Pradesh)

530. Meerut
Cantonment
Wheeler Club Ltd.
Cantonment
Meerut-250001
(Uttar Pradesh)

531. Meerut
Defence Colony,
Defence Colony,
Mawana Road, Cantonment,
Meerut-250001
(Uttar Pradesh)

532. मेरठ केसरगंज मुनिसिपल बोर्ड बिलिंग, दिल्ली रोड केसर गंज, मेरठ-250002 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	532. Meerut Kaisarganj Municipal Board Building Delhi Road, Kaisarganj, Meerut-250002 (Uttar Pradesh)
533. मोहकमपुर मोहकमपुर-250004 दिल्ली रोड, मेरठ लहरीन मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	533. Mohkampur Mohkampur-250004 Delhi Road, Meerut Tehsil, Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
534. मोदीनगर, राज टाकीज कंपाउंड दिल्ली-मेरठ रोड मोदीनगर-201201 गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	534. Modinagar Raj Talkies Compound Delhi-Meerut Road, Modi Nagar-201201 Ghaziabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
535. मोरना बुकान नं 14, 15, सेक्टर 18, नायड़ा, बिसराख ब्लॉक, मोरना-201301 गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	535. Morna Shop 14, 15, Sector 18, Naoda, Bisrakh Block Morna-201301 Ghaziabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
536. मुरादाबाद बर्तन बाजार, अमरोहा गेट, जाकपेटी संख 227, मुरादाबाद-244001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	536. Moradabad Bartan Bazar Amroha Gate, P.B. No. 227, Moradabad-244001 (Uttar Pradesh)
537. मुरादाबाद स्टेशन रोड, मुंबर मिनेस के सामने स्टेशन रोड, मुरादाबाद-244001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	537. Moradabad, Station Road, Opp. Kanwar Cinema, Station Road, Moradabad-244001 (Uttar Pradesh)
538. मुरादाबाद सिविल लाइन, सिविल लाइन, मुरादाबाद-244001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	538. Moradabad Civil Lines, Civil Lines, Moradabad -244001 (Uttar Pradesh)
539. मुर्लेहा सरधाना रोड, मुर्लेहा सरधाना जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	539. Mulhera Saradhana Road, Mulhera Sardhana District (Uttar Pradesh)
540. मुण्डाली नंगल	540. Mandali Nangal.
541. नरौली नरौली-202414, बेल्लारी नहरीन, मुरादाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	541. Narauli Narauli-202414, Bellary-Tehsil, Moradabad District, (Uttar Pradesh)
542. नारीपुरा मालपुरा रोड खेतीया एजर फोर्स स्टेशन नजदीक, नारीपुरा-282001 आगरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	542. Naripura Malpura Road, Near Kheria Air Force Station Naripura-282001 Agra District (Uttar Pradesh)

543. नंदगांव 8528
नंदगांव-281403
जानी तहसील
मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

544. नौजील
नौजील, मठ तहसील,
मथुरा जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश).

545. ओल
जवाहर हायरस्कूल बिल्डिंग,
ओल-281122,
मथुरा जिला, (उत्तर प्रदेश)

546. सिडीकेट बैंक
पलसों
मथुरा जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

547. पांखली खुदै
बागपत रोड, पांखली खुदै-250001
जानी खुदै तालुक,
तहसील, जिला मेरठ,
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

548. परतापुर
इंडस्ट्रीयल इस्टेट,
परतापुर-250103
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

549. फलावदा
फलावदा 250401
मवाना तालुक
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

550. पिलखुवा
गांधी रोड,
पिलखुवा-245304
गाजियाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

551. राधाकुण्ड
राधाकुण्ड-281504
मथुरा तहसील
मथुरा जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

552. रघुनाथपुर,
मेरठ-बागपत रोड,
रघुनाथपुर, जानी तालुक,
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

553. रायधना

554. रायपुर जाट
रायपुर जाट-281122
फराह तालुक
मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

543. Nandgaon-8528
Nandgaon-281403
Chhata Tehsil
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

544. Naujhil
Naujhil, Math Tehsil,
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

545. Ole
Jawahar High School Building
OLE-281122
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

546. Syndicate Bank
Palson
Mathura Tehsil
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

547. Panchli Khurd
Baghapat Road,
Panchli Khurd-250001
Jani Khurd Block,
Meerut Tehsil and District,
(Uttar Pradesh),

548. Partapur
Industrial Estate,
Partapur-250103
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

549. Phalauda
Phalauda-250401
Mawana Taluk
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

550. Pilkuwa,
Gandhi Road,
Pilkhuwa-245304
Ghaziabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

551. Radhakund
Radhakund-281504
Mathura Tehsil
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

552. Raghunathpur
Meerut-Baghapat Road,
Raghunathpur, Jani Block,
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

553. Raydhana

554. Raipur Jat
Raipur Jat-281122
Farah Block
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

555. राल	555. Ral
राल-281001 मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Ral-281 001 Mathura District (Uttar Pradesh)
556. रमेला	556. Ramela
लखीराम भवन रमेला-250617 मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Lakhiram Bhavan Ramela-250617 Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
557. रठोल	557. Rataul
रठोल-250609 खेकड़ा ब्लाक बागपत तहसील मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Ratual-250609 Khekra Block Baghapat Tehsil Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
558. रावली	558. Ravli
रावली मुरादनगर ब्लाक गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Ravli Muradnagar Block Ghaziabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
559. रोहटा	559. Rohta
रोहटा-250502 मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Rohta 250502 Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
560. सादाबाद	560. Sadabad
सर्वोदय आश्रम के नजदीक सादाबाद-281306 मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Near Sarvodaya-Ashram Sadabad-281306 Mathura District (Uttar Pradesh)
561. शहर	561. Sahar
शहर-281502 चोमा ब्लाक, छाता तहसील, मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Sahar-281502 Choma Block Chhata Tehsil Mathura District (Uttar Pradesh)
562. सहारनपुर चौक	562. Saharanpur Chowk
सलाक टावर बाजार, चौक प्रताप मार्केट सहारनपुर-247001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Clock Tower Bazar Chowk Pratap Market. Saharanpur-247001 (Uttar Pradesh)
563. साहिबाबाद	563. Sahibabad
सेंट्रल इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स लिमिटेड काम्प्लेक्स साइट नं० 4, प्लॉट नं० 1, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया साहिबाबाद-201005 गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Central Electronics Ltd. Complex Site No. 4 Plot No. 1. Industrial Area Sahibabad-201005 Ghaziabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
564. सलावा	564. Salawa
सलावा-250342 सरधना तालुका मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	Salawa-250342 Sardhana Taluk Meerut District (U.P.)

565. सम्बल
आर्य समाज रोड
बैंक स्ट्रीट, सम्बल 244302
मुरादाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश)

566. सपनावत
सपनावत
गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

567. सरथन
टाउन हाल रोड
शरखना-250342
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

568. शेरगढ़
रोडवेज बस स्टेशन के सामने
मेन रोड, शेरगढ़-281404
छाता तहसील,
मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

569. सीकरी कलां
दिल्ली मेरठ रोड
सीकरीकलां-201204
गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

570. शिंसारी
शिंसोली रायपुर ब्लाक
मेरठ तहसील, मेरठ जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

571. शिवालयाम
शिवाल खास
मेरठ तहसील, मेरठ जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

572. सोंडा
सोंडा-201204
मुनाड़ नगर ब्लाक
गाजियाबाद तहसील
गाजियाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

573. सोख
सोख-281123
मथुरा जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

574. सुरीर
सुरीर
गढ़ तहसील, मथुरा जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

575. सुसैन
सुरीर
सुसैन (उचगांव)-281306
सदाबाद ब्लाक
मथुरा जिला, मथुरा तहसील
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

565. Sambhal
Arya Samaj Road,
Bank Street
Sambhal -244302
Moradabad District (U.P.)

566. Sapnavat
Sapnavat
Ghaziabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

567. Sardhana
Town Hall Road,
Sardhana-250342
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

568. Shergarh
Opp. Roadways Bus Station
Main Road, Shergarh-281404
Chhata Tehsil,
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)
T.O. Chhata

569. Sikrikan
Delhi Meerut Road,
Sikrikan-201204
Ghaziabad District.
(Uttar Pradesh)

570. Sisoli
Sisoli Raipura Block
Meerut Tehsil
Meerut District (U.P.)

571. Siwalkhas
Siwalkhas
Meerut Tehsil
Meerut District.,
(Uttar Pradesh)

572. Sonda
Sonda -201204
Mirnud Nagar Block
Ghaziabad Tehsil
Ghaziabad Districts
(Uttar Pradesh)

573. Sonkh
Sonkh -281123
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

574. Surir
Surir
Mat Tehsil
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

575. Susain
Susain (Unchagaon)-281306
Sadabad Block
Mathura Tehsil
Mathura District
(Uttar Pradesh)

576. टरीगी टरीगी बागपत नहरील मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	576. Tatiri Tatiri Baghapat Tehsil Meerut District (Uttar Pradesh)
577. उपेदा उपेदा-245201 हापुर नहरील गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	577. Upeda Upeda-245201 Hapur Tehsil Ghaziabad District (Uttar Pradesh)
578. उनफार उनफार मथुरा ब्लॉक मथुरा नहरील (उत्तर प्रदेश)	578. Usfar Usfar, Mathura Block. Mathura Tehsil (Uttar Pradesh)
579. वानगंगी वानगंगी आनंद बाजार गोदोवालिया वानगंगी (उत्तर प्रदेश)	579. Varanasi Varanasi Anand Bazar Godowalia Varanasi (Uttar Pradesh)
580. वृन्दावन 745/382 प्रताप बाजार कृष्णनगर-281121 (मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	580. Vrindavan 745/382 Pratap Bazar Vrindavan-281121 Mathura District (Uttar Pradesh)
581. लखनऊ सहकारी भवन 14. विधान सभा मार्ग, हजरतगंज, लखनऊ-226001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	581. Lucknow Sahakari Bhavan 14, Vidhan Sabha Marg Hazratganj Lucknow-226 001 (Uttar Pradesh)
582. गाजियाबाद राजनगर सावित्रि भवन आर 5/20 गज नगर गाजियाबाद-201002 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	582. Ghaziabad Rajnagar Savithri Sadan, R. 5/20 Raj Nagar, Ghaziabad-201002 (Uttar Pradesh)
583. छौताला छौताला छाता ब्लॉक छाता नालूका मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	583. Dautana Dautana Chhata Block Chhata Taluk Mathura District (Uttar Pradesh)
584. रनहेरा रनहेरा-281404 छाता नहरील मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	584. Ranhera Rauhera -281404 Chhata Tehsil Mathura District (Uttar Pradesh)
585. कोटबन कोटबन नंदगांव ब्लॉक छाता तालूका मथुरा जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	585. Kotban Kotban Nandgaon Block. Chhata Taluk. Mathura District. (Uttar Pradesh)

586. मुरादाबाद
कचहरी रोड
मुरादाबाद-244001
मुरादाबाद जिला
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

587. मवाना खुर्द
मवाना तहसील
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

588. फैजाबाद
देवकली
मनोचा भवन, 1210, देवकली रोड,
देवकली, फैजाबाद-224001
(उत्तर प्रदेश)

589. मेरठ
सिंडीकेट बैंक
सण्डल कार्यालय
फ्लैट्सरेट कंपाउंड
मेरठ-250006 (उत्तर प्रदेश)

590. छनागार, मेरठ
सिंडीकेट बैंक, शिवाजी पार्क रोड
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

591. गाजियाबाद
सिंडीकेट बैंक
अग्रणी जिला कार्यालय
18 नवयुग मार्केट
गाजियाबाद-201001
गाजियाबाद जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

592. मथुरा
सिंडीकेट बैंक
अग्रणी जिला कार्यालय
1870/20, वार्ड नं० 4
शांति मार्केट, होली गेट
मथुरा आगरा मार्ग
मथुरा-281001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)

593. मेरठ
अग्रणी जिला कार्यालय
सिंडीकेट बैंक
सण्डल कार्यालय
फ्लैट्सरेट कंपाउंड
मेरठ-250006
मेरठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)

586. Moradabad
Katcheri Road
Moradabad-244001
Moradabad District,
(Uttar Pradesh)

587. Mawana Khurd
Mawana Tehsil
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

588. Faizabad
Devakali
Manocha Bhavan,
1210, Deokali Road,
Devkali,
Faizabad-224001
(Uttar Pradesh)

589. Meerut
Syndicate Bank
Divisional Office
Collectorate Compound
Meerut-250 006
(Uttar Pradesh)

590. Currency Chest
Meerut, Syndicate Bank
Shivaji Park Road,
Meerut District (U.P.)

591. Ghaziabad
Syndicate Bank
Lead District Office
18, Navyug Market,
Ghaziabad-201 001
Ghaziabad District
(Uttar Pradesh)

592. Mathura
Syndicate Bank
Lead District Office
1870/20, Ward No. 4,
Shanti Market Holi Gate,
Mathura Agra Road
Mathura-281 001
(Uttar Pradesh)

593. Meerut
Lead District Office
Syndicate Bank,
Divisional Office,
Collectorate Compound
Meerut 250 006
Meerut District
(Uttar Pradesh)

594. मुरादाबाद सिडीकेट बैंक अग्रणी जिला कार्यालय बर्टन बाजार मुरादाबाद - 44001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	594. Moradabad Syndicate Bank Lead Bank office Bartan Bazar Moradabad-244 001 (Uttar Pradesh)
595. आगरा सिडीकेट बैंक मण्डल कार्यालय 33/69 ए. अजमेर मार्ग मेट अंथोनी स्कूल के शामने आगरा-282001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	595. Agra Syndicate Bank Divisional office 33/69, A. Ajmer Road, opp. St. Antony's School Agra-282 001 (Uttar Pradesh).
596. गार्जियाबाद सिडीकेट बैंक मण्डल कार्यालय 17/18, नवयुग मार्केट गार्जियाबाद-201001 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	596. Ghaziabad Syndicate Bank Divisional office 17/18, Navyug Market Ghaziabad-201 001 (Uttar Pradesh)
597. नांगला	597. Jhadina
598. हरोडा	598. Harora
599. अनपरा	599. Anpara
600. अजयपुर	600. Ajayapur
601. मुंगाली नांगल सिडीकेट बैंक, नगला शास्त्रा ग्राम नंगलामाल, इकाइर माड खास, गणपुर ल्लाक तहसील और जिला मंडल (उत्तर प्रदेश)	601. Nangla Syndicate Bank Nagla Branch, village Nanglamal P.O. Mau Khas Rajpura Block, Tehsil & District, Meerut U.P.
602. नावल सिडीकेट बैंक ग्राम नावल झाफियर लिंग्याना-250104 मंगठ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश)	602. Naval Syndicate Bank village Naval P.O. Laliyana 250104 Meerut District, U.P.
4. स्टेट बैंक भारत शेक्सेर एण्ड मध्यपुर/ 1. अलवर जिला:—	STATE BANK OF BIKANER AND JAIPUR
603. बहवांग	1. ALWAR DISTRICT
604. बानस्पुर	603. Behror
605. किशनगढ़ जाग	604. Bensur
606. राजगढ़	605. Kishangarh Bas
607. तिजारा	606. Raigarh
608. खोह	607. Tijara
609. मस्य औ० थे० अलवर,	608. Khoh
2. अलवर जिला	609. Matsya I.E. Alwar
610. केकड़ी	2. AJMER DISTRICT
3. बांतवाडा जिला	610. Kekri
611. कुशालगढ़	3. BANSWARA DISTRICT
612. घाटोल	611. Khushalgarh
4. बाडमेर जिला	612. Ghantol
613. भमवडी	4. BARMER DISTRICT
614. लंजप	613. Samdari
615. पारलू	614. Khandap
616. टापरा	615. Parlu
617. कवास	616. Tapra
618. आसोटरा	617. Kawas
409 GI/83--13	618. Asotra.

5. भरतपुर जिला

619. डीग

620. कामा

621. नगर

622. वैर

623. जिलाधीश कार्यालय भरतपुर

6. भोलधाड़ा

624. गंगापुर

625. हुर्दा गुलाबपुर

626. माडल

627. मांडलगढ़

628. शाहपुरा

629. और्जोँ बोलिया

630. अगूचा

7. दीकानेर जिला

631. भीनासर

632. देशनोक

633. खाजुवाला

634. कोलायत

635. लूनकरणसर

636. कूठविंशां लूनकरणसर

637. नोखा

638. पांच

639. प्रस्तु

640. बीचवाल आर० सी० पी० कालोनी

8. दूदी जिला

641. नैनवा

642. बाई-पास रोड़ दूदी

9. चित्तोड़गढ़ जिला

643. बड़ी सादड़ी

644. छोटी सादड़ी

645. डुंगला

646. कपासन

10. छुरुजिला

647. और० क्षेत्र सादुलपुर.

11. गंगानगर जिला

648. डबललीवास मोलीवाला

649. अनुसंगी कार्यालय गंगानगर

650. खुंजा

651. मिर्जावाला

652. रिडमलसर

653. तलवाड़ा झील

654. टीबी

655. डाबड़ी

656. नौरंगदेशर

657. रामगढ़ उजलवास

658. मिर्जावाली मेर

659. गुलाबवाला

660. पी० ब्लॉक, श्री गंगानगर

12. जैसलमेर जिला

661. रामगढ़

13. जयपुर जिला

662. वस्ती

5. BHARATPUR DISTRICT

619. Deeg

620. Kaman

621. Nagar

622. Weir

623. Collectorate, Bharatpur

6. BHILWARA DISTRICT

624. Gangapur

625. Hurda Gulabpura

626. Mandal

627. Mandalgarh

628. Shahpura

629. Industrial Estate, Biliya

630. Agoocha

7. BIKANER DISTRICT

631. Bhinasar

632. Deshnoka

633. Khajuwala

634. Kolayat

635. Lunkaransar

636. ADB Lunkaransar

637. Nokha

638. Panchoo

639. Jhajhu

640. Beechwal RCP Colony

8. BUNDI DISTRICT

641. Nainwa

642. By-pass Road, Bundi

9. CHITTORGARH DISTRICT

643. Bari Sadri

644. Chhoti Sadri

645. Dungla

646. Kapasan

10. CHURU DISTRICT

647. Ind. Estate, Sadulpur

11. GANGANAGAR DISTRICT

648. Dabliwas Moliwala

649. Satellite Office, Ganganagar

650. Khunja

651. Mirzawala

652. Ridmalsar.

653. Talwara Jhil

654. Tibbi

655. Dabri

656. Naurangdesar

657. Ramgarh Ujalwas

658. Mirzawali Mer

659. Gulabewala

660. P. Block, Sriganganagar

12. JAISALMER DISTRICT

661. Ramgarh

13. JAIPUR DISTRICT

662. Bassi

663. गोविंदगढ़ मलिकपुर	663. Govindgarh Malikpur
664. जमदारामगढ़	664. Jamwa Ramgarh
665. लालमोठ	665. Lalot
666. फागी	666. Phagi
667. शाहपुर	667. Shahpura
14. जालोर ज़िला	14. JALORE DISTRICT
668. बिथनगढ़	668. Bishangarh
15. शालावड़ ज़िला	15. JHALAWAR DISTRICT
669. खानपुर	669. Khanpur
670. सुनेल	670. Sunel
16. खूलंग ज़िला	16. JHUNJHUNU DISTRICT
671. खूलंग	671. Jhunjhunu
672. चिरावा	672. Chirawa
673. क्षेत्री	673. Khetri
674. नवलगढ़	674. Nawalgarh
675. सूरजगढ़	675. Surajgarh
17. जोधपुर ज़िला	17. JODHPUR DISTRICT
676. विलाड़ा	676. Bilara
677. ओसिया	677. Osian
18. कोटा ज़िला	18. KOTA DISTRICT
678. कूदविंगाड़ लालड़ा गुजर	678. A.D.B. Chhabra Gujarat
679. डिगोद	679. Digod
680. किशनगंज	680. Kishanganj
19. नागोर ज़िला	19. NAGAUR DISTRICT
681. उगाना	681. Degana
682. दीड़वाना	682. Didwana
683. कुचेरा	683. Kuchera
684. लालन	684. Ladnun
685. परवनमर	685. Parbatsar
686. कृषि उपज मण्डी, नागोर	686. Krishi Upaj Mandi, Nagpur
687. कृषि उपज मण्डी, मेड़नासिटी	687. Krishi Upaj Mandi, Mertacity
20. पाली ज़िला	20. PALI DISTRICT
688. वाली	688. Bali
689. कू० वि० शा० सोजत रोड	689. A.D.B. Sojat Road
690. सोजत सिटी	690. Sojat City
691. सुमेरपुर	691. Sumerpur
692. शौ०खौ० पाली	692. Ind. Estate Pali
693. कृषि उपज मण्डी पाली	693. Krishi Upaj Mandi, Pali
21. सेवाई माधोपुर ज़िला	21. SAWAI MADHOPUR DISTRICT
694. आमनदास	694. Bamanwas
695. खल्लार	695. Khandsar
696. नादोती	696. Nadoti
697. सपोटरा	697. Sapotra
698. सुरोठ	698. Suroth
699. टोडाखीम	699. Todabhim
700. बोली	700. Bonli
701. इंदिरा कालोनी, नवाई माधोपुर	701. Indira Colony, Sawai Madhopur
22. सोकर ज़िला	22. SIKAR DISTRICT
702. फतेहपुर	702. Fatehpur
703. लक्खमनगढ़ सीकर	703. Lachhmangarh Sikar
704. नीम का थाना	704. Neem-ka-thana
705. श्री माधोपुर	705. Sri Madhopur

706. औंकोर सीकार
 23. सिरोही जिला
 707. एयोंज
 708. आबू रोड
 24. टोक जिला
 709. डिमी
 710. टोदारायरिंग
 711. उनियारा
 25. उदयपुर जिला
 712. राजसमन्द
 713. मेनार
 714. लखर्वास
 715. इंतालिखेरा
 716. नयागांव
 717. लखावाली
 718. देवगढ़मदारिया
 719. खेरवारा
 720. आमेट
 721. फलासिया
 722. नाथद्वारा
 723. मात्तली
 724. कुम्भलगढ़
 725. बाली जस्साखेड़ा
 726. जावद
 727. सनथाड़
 कार्यपोर्टन बैक
 728. रिल्ली शेक्कीय कार्यालय और
 उम्मके शेक्कीयिकार में अपने बाली
 सभी शास्त्राण
 बारोरिणन बैक
 शेक्कीय कार्यालय (दिल्ली)
 एम० 93, पहली मंजिल
 कनाट संकंल, उत्कमेडी
 म० 162
 नई दिल्ली-110001

706. Ind. Estate, Sikar
 23. SIROHI DISTRICT
 707. Sheoganj
 708. Abu Road
 24. TONK DISTRICT
 709. Diggi
 710. Toda Raisingh
 711. Uniara
 25. UDAIPUR DISTRICT
 712. Rajsmand
 713. Menar
 714. Lakharwas
 715. Intalikhera
 716. Nayagaon
 717. Lakhawali
 718. Deogarh Madaria
 719. Kherwara
 720. Amet
 721. Phalasia
 722. Nathdwara
 723. Mavli
 724. Kumbhalgarh
 725. Bali Jassakhera
 726. Jawad
 727. Sanwad

CORPORATION BANK

728. Regional Office, Delhi and all branches under its
 jurisdiction :
 Corporation Bank
 Regional Office, Delhi
 M-93, First Floor,
 Connaught Circus, D.B. No.162,
 New Delhi-110001.